

# Mono County Housing Element



---

**Prepared by Mono County Community Development Department  
August 2009**

# **Mono County Housing Element**

**Adopted  
March 29, 1993**

**Updated  
March 16, 2004**

**Amended  
May 15, 2007**

**Updated  
August 18, 2009**



**Mono County Community Development Department  
PO Box 347  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546  
760.924.1800 [www.monocounty.ca.gov](http://www.monocounty.ca.gov)**

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION OF HOUSING POLICY DEVELOPMENT

1800 Third Street, Suite 430  
P. O. Box 952053  
Sacramento, CA 94252.2053  
(918) 323-3177 / FAX (916) 327.2643  
[www.hcd.ca.gov](http://www.hcd.ca.gov)

November 25, 2009

Mr. Scott Burns, Director  
Community Development Department  
Mono County  
P.O. Box 8  
Bridgeport, CA 93517

Dear Mr. Burns:

RE: Review of the County of Mono's Adopted Housing Element

Thank you for submitting the County of Mono's adopted housing element received for review on August 28, 2009. The Department is required to review adopted housing elements and report the findings to the locality pursuant to Government Code Section 65585(h). Communications with you facilitated the review.

The adopted element addresses the statutory requirements described in the Department's August 13, 2009 review. Therefore, the Department is pleased to find Mono County's adopted element in compliance with State housing element law (Article 10.6 of the Government Code). Among other things, the element now includes programs to amend zoning to permit emergency shelters without a conditional use permit or other discretionary action. To accommodate the regional housing need of lower income households, the County's identification of adequate sites is dependent on small residential and commercial sites to facilitate multifamily development. Mono County should monitor the effectiveness of these sites in providing development opportunities for housing for lower-income households through the annual progress reports required pursuant to Government Code Section 65400. Should monitoring reveal these sites are not effective in providing housing opportunities for lower-income households, the element should be revised to add or modify programs, as appropriate. For example, the County could rezone commercial sites to exclusively multifamily or expand incentives and concessions to facilitate lot consolidation.

Mono County now meets specific requirements for several State funding programs designed to reward local governments for compliance with State housing element law. For example, the Housing Related Parks Programs, authorized by Proposition 1C, Local Housing Trust Fund and the Building Equity and Growth in Neighborhoods (BEGIN) Program include housing element compliance either as a threshold or competitive factor in rating and ranking applications. More specific Information about these and other programs is available on the Department's website at [http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/loan\\_grant\\_hecompl011708.pdf](http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/plan/he/loan_grant_hecompl011708.pdf)

Mr. Scott Burns, Director

Page 2

The Department wishes Mono County success in implementing its housing element and looks forward to following its progress through the General Plan annual progress reports pursuant to Government Code Section 65400. We are particularly thankful of your hard work and cooperation. If the Department can provide assistance in implementing the housing element, please contact Jess Negrete, of our staff, at (916) 323-3185.

Sincerely,

Cathy E. Creswell  
Deputy Director

# Table of Contents

---

I. Introduction.....	1
Public Participation Process.....	1
Comments .....	3
Consistency with the General Plan .....	3
II. Housing Needs .....	5
A. Background.....	5
Area Profile.....	5
Sources for Demographic & Housing Data .....	5
Census Terminology .....	5
Census Sampling.....	6
2009 Updated Demographic Data.....	6
B. Existing Needs .....	7
Population Characteristics .....	7
Population Growth.....	7
Ethnicity.....	9
Age.....	11
Household Characteristics .....	14
Household Growth.....	14
Household Tenure.....	14
Occupancy Status.....	17
Overcrowded Households.....	19
Extremely Low-Income Households.....	21
Households Overpaying.....	22
Employment, Income & Poverty.....	24
Overall Employment Trends.....	24
Employment Trends Unincorporated Area .....	25
Major Employers in Mono County .....	26
Place of Work .....	27
Income.....	27
Poverty .....	28
Housing Stock Characteristics .....	33
Housing Types .....	33
Housing Stock Conditions .....	35
C. Special Housing Needs .....	37
Persons with Disabilities.....	37
Elderly.....	38
Large Households .....	40
Farmworkers .....	41
Female Headed Households.....	42
Emergency Shelter Needs and Homeless Housing .....	43
U.S. Marine Corps .....	44

D.	Projected Housing Needs .....	45
	Regional Housing Need .....	45
	Quantified Objectives .....	47
III.	Resources and Constraints .....	48
A.	Land Inventory .....	48
	Physical and Environmental Constraints .....	48
	Zoning for Lower Income Housing .....	50
	Availability of Infrastructure.....	52
	Redevelopable Sites .....	54
	Sites & Zoning That Facilitate Housing for Farmworkers and Homeless .....	54
	Sites Inventory and Analysis.....	55
B.	Governmental Constraints .....	67
	Land Use Controls .....	67
	Land Use Requirements Imposed by Other Agencies.....	71
	Codes and Enforcement .....	73
	On/Off Site Improvement Standards.....	73
	Fees and Exactions.....	78
	Development Fee Information .....	83
	Processing and Permitting Procedures .....	83
	Constraints on Persons with Disabilities .....	86
C.	Non-Governmental Constraints .....	89
	Land Costs .....	89
	Construction Costs .....	90
	Availability of Financing .....	90
	Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate Uses .....	92
	Energy Conservation.....	92
IV.	Progress Report.....	95
	Housing Law Requirements.....	95
	Progress Report 2004 Housing Element .....	95
	Provision of Adequate Sites.....	95
	Housing for Low and Moderate Incomes.....	105
	Programs to Address Governmental Constraints .....	110
	Conservation and Rehabilitation.....	112
	Equal Housing Opportunities.....	117
	Preserving Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate Uses .....	118
V.	Summary of Conclusions .....	120
	Summary Overview .....	120
	Population Characteristics .....	120
	Household Characteristics .....	121
	Employment.....	127
	Housing Characteristics .....	128
	Regional Housing Need .....	129

Land Use Inventory .....	130
Governmental Constraints .....	132
Non-Governmental Constraints .....	135
Key Findings by Planning Area .....	136
VI. Housing Program .....	141
Statutory Requirements .....	141
Housing Policies and Programs .....	141
Provision of Adequate Sites .....	141
Housing for Low and Moderate Incomes.....	148
Programs to Address Governmental Constraints .....	153
Conservation and Rehabilitation.....	155
Equal Housing Opportunities.....	159
Preserving Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate Uses .....	160
VII. References.....	162
VIII. Appendix A.....	167
IX. Appendix B.....	181

## Tables

---

Table 1	Population Growth Trends, Mono County, 1980-2008 .....	7
Table 2	Population Growth Trends, Unincorporated Mono County, 1980-2008 .....	8
Table 3	Total Population by Planning Area, Unincorporated Mono County, 1980-2008 .....	8
Table 4	Total Population, Hispanic or Latino by Race, by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000.....	9
Table 5	Population Projections by Ethnicity, Mono County, 2010-2030 .....	10
Table 6	Total Population by Race, by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000.....	10
Table 7	Median Age by Sex by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000.....	11
Table 8	Population by Age, Unincorporated Mono County, 1990-2000 .....	11
Table 9	Total Population by Age, by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000 .....	12
Table 10	Population Projections by Age, Mono County, 2010-2030 .....	13
Table 11	Households by Planning Area, Mono County, 1990-2000 .....	14
Table 12	Average Household Size by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000.....	15
Table 13	Renters by Housing Type by Planning Area, Mono County, 1990-2000 .....	16
Table 14	Household Tenure by Planning Area, Mono County, 1990-2000.....	16
Table 15	Vacancy Status, Unincorporated Mono County, 1990-2000 .....	17
Table 16	Vacancy Status by Planning Area, Unincorporated Mono County, 2000.....	18
Table 17	Overcrowded Households by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000 .....	20
Table 18	Occupational Employment Statistics, Mono County, 2008 .....	21



Table 19	ELI Households, Housing Statistics by Tenure, Mono County, 2000 .....	22
Table 20	ELI Households/All Households, Housing Statistics, Mono County, 2000 ...	22
Table 21	Households Overpaying by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000 .....	23
Table 22	Employment by Industry, Mono County.....	25
Table 23	Employment by Industry, Unincorporated Mono County, Civilian Population 16 and Older, 2000.....	26
Table 24	Place of Work for Workers 16 Years and Older by Planning Area, Unincorporated Mono County, 2000 .....	29
Table 25	Travel Time to Work, Workers 16 Years and Older by Planning Area, Unincorporated Mono County, 2000 .....	29
Table 26	Median Household Income by Age by Planning Area, Mono County, 1999 (dollars).....	30
Table 27	Type of Household Income by Planning Area, Mono County, 1999 (dollars)	31
Table 28	Persons with Income Below Poverty Level, by Planning Areas, Unincorporated Mono County, 1989 and 1999 .....	32
Table 29	Families with Income Below Poverty Level, by Planning Areas, Unincorporated Mono County, 1989 and 1999 .....	32
Table 30	Housing Units by Type, Unincorporated Mono County, 1990-2000.....	33
Table 31	Housing Units by Type by Planning Area, Unincorporated Mono County, 1990-2000 .....	34
Table 32	Housing Conditions, Unincorporated Mono County, 2009 .....	35
Table 33	Age of Housing by Planning Area, Unincorporated Mono County, 2000 .....	36
Table 34	Persons with Disability by Employment Status (2000)--Unincorporated Mono County.....	38
Table 35	Persons with Disability by Disability Type (2000)--Unincorporated Mono County.....	38
Table 36	Householders by Tenure by Age by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000 .....	39
Table 37	Household Size by Tenure, Unincorporated Mono County, 2000.....	40
Table 38	Large Households by Tenure by Planning Area, Unincorporated Mono County, 2000.....	40
Table 39	Number of Farmworkers (2007)--Mono County .....	41
Table 40	Farmworkers by Days Worked (2007)--Mono County .....	41
Table 41	Female Headed Households (2000)--Unincorporated Mono County .....	42
Table 42	Female Headed Households by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000.....	43
Table 43	Regional Housing Needs, Unincorporated Mono County, 2007-2014 .....	45
Table 44	Units Constructed, Unincorporated Mono County, January 2007 to August 2009.....	46
Table 45	Progress Toward the Regional Housing Need, Unincorporated Mono County, 2007-2009 .....	46
Table 46	Quantified Objectives .....	47
Table 47	Land Use Inventory.....	60
Table 48 A	Housing Types Permitted by Land Use Designation .....	69
Table 48 B	Residential Development Standards by Land Use Designation .....	70
Table 49	Mono County Development Fees .....	80



Table 50 Timelines for Permit Processing..... 86

# I. INTRODUCTION

---

In response to California's critical housing needs, the Legislature enacted housing element law with the goal of providing adequate and safe housing for every Californian. The attainment of housing for all requires the cooperation of local and state governments.

Housing element law requires local governments to adequately plan to meet their existing and projected housing needs including their share of the regional housing need. Housing element law is the state's primary market-based strategy to increase housing supply. The law recognizes the most critical decisions regarding housing development occur at the local level within the context of the General Plan. In order for the private sector to adequately address housing needs and demand, local governments must adopt land use plans and regulatory schemes that provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development for all income groups.

Unlike the other mandatory elements of the General Plan, the Housing Element is subject to detailed statutory requirements regarding its content and must be updated every five years. The Housing Element is also subject to mandatory review by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). This reflects the statutory recognition that the availability of housing is a matter of statewide importance and that cooperation between all levels of government and the private sector is critical to attainment of the state's housing goals.

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS**

The initial draft of the 2009 Housing Element Update was prepared by the Mono County Community Development Department. Housing issues and concerns for the unincorporated area were identified through ongoing discussions with the County's nine community and Regional Planning Advisory Committees (RPACs), which include a variety of local residents and local representatives from local, state, and federal agencies. Mammoth Lakes Housing staff attended RPAC meetings throughout the County in an effort to better understand the specific housing needs of each community. Those sessions were held as public outreach for the Mono County Housing Element Update. Based on comments received at those meetings, the existing Housing Element Policies were reviewed for consistency with community comments. Comments from those meetings are included in Appendix A and have been addressed throughout the element.

Attempts were made to contact Hispanic community groups directly but there are currently no Hispanic groups active in the County. Flyers in Spanish and English were placed in the local newspaper and at local community centers and gathering places seeking comments on housing conditions in the County.

Mono County includes several Native American groups, two federally recognized tribes, the Bridgeport Indian Colony and the Utu Utu Gwaitu Paiute Tribe of Benton, and two

non-recognized groups, the Antelope Valley Indian Community and the Mono Lake Indian Community (Kutzad Ka Paiute Tribe). These groups were contacted directly.

The Collaborative Planning Team also reviewed the County's housing policies. The Collaborative Planning Team is a multi-agency planning team, consisting of local, state, and federal agencies, which focuses on a variety of planning and resource use issues in the Eastern Sierra. Members include Mono County, the Town of Mammoth Lakes, the Bureau of Land Management, the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, the California Department of Fish and Game, Caltrans, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, the Inyo National Forest, the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, the Benton Paiute Reservation, and the Bridgeport Indian Colony.

The draft update was circulated to local agencies and organizations that provide housing-related services in the County, including:

- Inyo Mono Area Agency on Aging (IMAAA), Bishop, California;
- Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA), Bishop, California;
- Inyo Mono Association for the Handicapped (IMAH), Bishop, California;
- Kern Regional Center, Bishop, California;
- Mammoth Lakes Housing, Mammoth Lakes, California; and
- Mono County Department of Social Services, Bridgeport, California.

Notice of the availability of the draft was also provided through publication in the local newspaper and by posting at County offices and public libraries.

Both the Mono County Housing Authority and the Board of Supervisors held public workshops to address housing issues and policies. The Mono County Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Draft 2009 Housing Element Update, at which time the draft element was considered along with public comments. The Planning Commission submitted a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to adopt the draft Update. The Board of Supervisors has scheduled a public hearing to consider the draft update and to hear additional testimony prior to any modifications and final adoption.

## **COMMENTS**

No comments were received from members of the Hispanic or Native American communities in the County. Comments from RPAC members focused primarily on affordable housing and rehabilitation of existing housing. Comments from a variety of agencies such as IMAAA and Mammoth Lakes Housing focused on providing current information on the facilities and services provided by those agencies. No comments were received on the draft update during the Planning Commission hearing.

## **CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN**

Development in Mono County is affected by policies in the County's General Plan, by standards in the Mono County Land Development Regulations, by land use requirements imposed by other agencies, and by requirements of the Subdivision Map Act and the County's Subdivision Ordinance. The County's General Plan serves as a comprehensive, long-range plan for the development of the area. The location of housing is determined primarily by policies contained in the Land Use Element, which establish the amount and distribution of various land uses throughout the County. The Land Use Element also specifies the maximum allowable density for each residential General Plan designation.

In conformance with state law, the Mono County General Plan has been written to be internally consistent; the goals, objectives and policies of each element are intended to be consistent with those in other elements. The 2003 Housing Element Update was reviewed for consistency with the Land Use Element to determine if adequate sites are provided to allow for housing for all economic segments of the community. The Land Use Inventory shows that Mono County has more than adequate acreage to accommodate the housing needs projected by HCD in the Regional Housing Needs Plan prepared for the County.

The Housing Element was also reviewed for consistency with the Circulation and Conservation/Open Space Elements of the General Plan. In Mono County, the circulation system is well established, and there is little traffic congestion. When congestion does occur, it is not the result of residents' commuting, but of recreational traffic at peak use periods, combined with local use. Although the existing circulation system is generally adequate to provide for additional housing, the Circulation Element provides for improvements to the local transportation system that will allow for the continued development of housing.

Since 94 percent of the land in Mono County is publicly owned, and 90 percent is federally owned, much of Mono County remains open space. As a result, the provision of open space as a part of developed residential areas is not a particular concern in the County. Policies in both the Conservation/Open Space Element and the Land Use Element focus future development in existing community areas, providing additional open-space protection.

General Plan consistency for all elements, including the Housing Element, will be maintained through required annual progress reports that address comments and issues

identified through the County's ongoing public participation processes, such as Regional Planning Advisory Committee (RPAC) meetings.

## II. HOUSING NEEDS

---

### A. BACKGROUND

---

#### AREA PROFILE

Mono County is located on the eastern side of the Sierra Nevada mountain range and is bordered to the east by the state of Nevada. Approximately 94 percent of the County's 3,103 square miles is publicly owned; as a result, tourism and recreation-oriented enterprises are the primary economic activity in the County. The major population center, and the County's only incorporated area, is the town of Mammoth Lakes. The remainder of the County's residents are scattered in small communities throughout the County.

Communities in the County include: Topaz, Coleville and Walker in the Antelope Valley; Bridgeport, the County seat, in the Bridgeport Valley; Mono City and Lee Vining in the Mono Basin; June Lake in the June Lake Loop; Long Valley, McGee Creek, Crowley Lake, Aspen Springs and Sunny Slopes in Long Valley; Swall Meadows and Paradise in the Wheeler Crest area; and Chalfant, Hammil and Benton in the Tri-Valley.

#### SOURCES FOR DEMOGRAPHIC & HOUSING DATA

The majority of the demographic and housing data in the following sections are from the U.S. Census 2000. Some of the data are available only for the unincorporated portion of the County; other data are available for block groups within the County (see Census Terminology section). The census data presented here are a synopsis of the data available from Census 2000. Complete census files can be found at <http://factfinder.census.gov>. Additional demographic and economic information is available from the California Department of Finance ([www.dof.ca.gov](http://www.dof.ca.gov)).

#### CENSUS TERMINOLOGY

The following census terminology applies to Mono County:

"Census Tract" – A small, relatively permanent statistical subdivision of a County delineated by a local committee of census data users for the purpose of presenting data. Census tract boundaries normally follow visible features, but may follow governmental unit boundaries and other non-visible features in some instances; they always nest within counties. Census Tract 1 in Mono County is the unincorporated area. Census Tract 2 in Mono County is the Town of Mammoth Lakes.

"Block Group" – A subdivision of a census tract, a block group consists of all the blocks within a census tract beginning with the same number. In Mono County, the block groups are roughly equivalent to the County's planning area boundaries, i.e.,

Block Group 1 = Antelope Valley west of U.S. 395

Block Group 2 = Antelope Valley east of U.S. 395

Block Group 3 = Bridgeport Valley

Block Group 4 = Mono Basin  
Block Group 5 = June Lake  
Block Group 6 = Long Valley and Wheeler Crest  
Block Group 7 = Tri-Valley

"Block" – A subdivision of a census tract. Many blocks correspond to individual city blocks bounded by streets, but blocks – especially in rural areas – may include many square miles and may have some boundaries that are not streets.

## **CENSUS SAMPLING**

The census collects data utilizing both short form and long forms. Long forms are sent only to a sample of households, and the responses on them must be weighted to reflect the entire population. Each household responding with a long form represents, on average, six or seven other households that reported using short forms. Census statisticians then use the long forms to estimate results for the entire population.

The counts from the short form are identified as 100-Percent Data and are included on Summary File 1 (SF 1) and Summary File 2 (SF 2). The estimates from the long form are identified as Sample Data and are included on Summary File 3 (SF 3) and Summary File 4 (SF 4). As a result of the way the estimates are prepared, for smaller geographic units such as block groups, the estimates for characteristics that are also counted on the short form will not match the counts reported the short form (i.e., the long form estimates in SF 3 will not match the values in SF 1 and SF 2). The official values for items reported on the short form come from SF 1 and SF 2. This occurs primarily with population and housing unit data. SF 1 gives exact numbers for even very small groups and areas; SF 3 gives estimates for small groups and areas that are less exact.

In the following analyses, there are instances when the estimates in SF 3 do not match the values in SF 1. These are indicated in the text. For a complete explanation, see "Comparing SF 3 Estimates with Corresponding Values in SF 1 and SF 2" ([factfinder.census.gov/home/en/epss/sf3\\_compare.html](http://factfinder.census.gov/home/en/epss/sf3_compare.html)).

## **2009 UPDATED DEMOGRAPHIC DATA**

Limited additional demographic data are available for Mono County as a whole; even less current demographic data are available for the unincorporated portion of the County. The State Department of Finance provides annual population estimates and projections for counties and cities. The US Census Bureau, with input from other Federal agencies, created the Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program to provide more current estimates of selected income and poverty statistics than those provided by the census. Additional data were also obtained from HUD and the Bureau of Economic Analysis. Where available, current demographic figures have been utilized in this update.



## B. EXISTING NEEDS

### POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS

#### POPULATION GROWTH

Population growth trends in Mono County and its only incorporated city, the Town of Mammoth Lakes, have shifted in recent years from long-term trends that began around 1990. In the nineties, the percentage of the County's total population living in the Town of Mammoth Lakes increased from 48 percent of the total population to 55 percent of the total population (see Table 1). Recently, the percentage of the population living in Mammoth Lakes has declined slightly due to rising costs in Mammoth Lakes and downward shifts in the local economy. Development in Mammoth Lakes is currently stagnant and residential growth in Mammoth Lakes is not expected to continue in the short-term.

**Table 1 Population Growth Trends, Mono County, 1980-2008**

	<b>1980</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2008</b>
Mammoth Lakes	4,117/48%	4,785/48%	7,094/55%	7,413/54%
Unincorporated Mono Co.	4,460/52%	5,171/52%	5,759/45%	6,346/46%
Total Mono County	8,577/100%	9,956/100%	12,853/100%	13,759/100%

Sources: *US Census 1980 and 1990; U.S. Census 2000, SF1:P1, California Department of Finance Report E-5.*

Population growth in the unincorporated areas of Mono County was rapid from 1980 until 2000, when it slowed considerably. In recent years, the growth rate in the unincorporated area has increased again, due primarily to a need for housing for residents working in Mammoth Lakes (see Table 2). Population growth in the unincorporated areas is anticipated to continue, due to the continuing need for low- to moderate-income housing for workers and professionals employed in the County and the high cost of living in the Town of Mammoth Lakes.

During the period 1980-2000, the percentage of the unincorporated population living in Antelope Valley, Mono Basin, and Tri-Valley remained fairly constant (Table 3). The percentage of the population living in Bridgeport Valley increased between 1980 and 1990 but decreased by 2000 to 1980 levels (Table 3). During this period, the percentage of the unincorporated population living in June Lake decreased from 17.98 percent to 10.64 percent and the percentage of the unincorporated population living in Long Valley/Wheeler Crest increased from 19.64 percent to 25.47 percent (Table 3).

**Table 2 Population Growth Trends, Unincorporated Mono County**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Numerical Change</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>	<b>Average Annual Change</b>	
				<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1980	4,460	---	---	---	---
1990	5,171	711	15.9%	72	1.6%
2000	5,759	588	11.4%	59	1.1%
2003	5,877	118	2.0%	39	0.7%
2008	6,346	469	7.9%	94	1.6%

Sources: US Census 1980 and 1990; U.S. Census 2000, SF1:P1, California Department of Finance Report E-5.

**Table 3 Total Population by Planning Area, Unincorporated Mono County, 1980-2008**

	<b>1980 Pop.</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>1990 Pop.</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>2000 Pop.</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>2008 Pop.</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
<b>Antelope Valley</b>	1,187	26.62	1,328	25.68	1,525	26.48	1,681	26.48
<b>Bridgeport Valley</b>	573	12.85	843	16.29	704	12.22	776	12.22
<b>Mono Basin</b>	317	7.11	398	7.7	496	8.6	546	8.6
<b>June Lake</b>	802	17.98	581	11.24	613	10.64	675	10.64
<b>Long Valley/ Wheeler Crest</b>	876	19.64	1121	21.68	1,467	25.47	1,617	25.47
<b>Tri-Valley</b>	705	15.81	900	17.40	954	16.57	1,052	16.57
<b>Total Unincorporated Area</b>	4,460	100	5,171	100	5,759	100	6,346	100

Note: The 2000 population for Antelope Valley includes 104 in military housing; the 2000 population for Bridgeport Valley includes 35 in the County jail; the 2000 population for Mono Basin includes one in noninstitutional group quarters. Figures for 2008 assume that the same percentage of the total unincorporated area population will be living in those communities in 2008 as was in 2000.

Sources: U.S. Census 1980; U.S. Census 1990; U.S. Census 2000, SF1:P1, California Department of Finance, Report E-5.

## ETHNICITY

In the 1990 census, the ethnic composition of Mono County was predominantly white (93 percent), with 3.7 percent American Indian, <1 percent Black, 1.3 percent Asian, and 1.9 percent Other Race. Persons of Hispanic Origin, which includes people of all races, encompassed 11.3 percent of the population. In 2000, the population was 85.4 percent white, 4.8 percent American Indian, <1 percent Black, <1 percent Asian, <1 percent Pacific Islander, 6.0 percent Other Race, and 2.4 percent two or more races (Table 6). While this seems a drop in the white population, it probably reflects more of a change in the way ethnicity was tabulated in the census data rather than a real change in the population.

The percentage of the population identifying themselves as Hispanic or Latino, of whatever race, remained relatively unchanged in the unincorporated area, rising from 11.3 percent of the population in 1990 to 12.4 percent of the population in 2000 (Table 4), a numerical increase of 114 persons, from 585 in 1990 to 699 in 2000. This population is fairly evenly distributed throughout the County's communities (Table 4). Anecdotal data indicate that the Hispanic population is employed throughout the County in service jobs and has continued to increase since the 2000 census.

**Table 4 Total Population, Hispanic, by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	<b>Not Hispanic or Latino</b>
Antelope Valley	140	1,385
Bridgeport Valley	105	599
Mono Basin	120	376
June Lake	95	518
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	132	1,335
Tri-Valley	<u>107</u>	<u>847</u>
Total Unincorporated Area	699	5,060
(Percent of Total Pop.)	12.14%	87.86%

Sources: U.S. Census 2000, SF1:P4.

During this same period, the Hispanic/Latino population in Mammoth Lakes increased from 14.5 percent of the town's population in 1990 to 22.2 percent of the town's population in 2000. The State Department of Finance is projecting that the Hispanic population in the County will rise dramatically over the next twenty years, to 43 percent of the total County population in 2020 and 57 percent of the total in 2030 (see Table 5). Although Mammoth Lakes has a large Hispanic population, the rise in the Hispanic population could impact housing in the unincorporated area, as many of the Hispanic population tend to be lower-paid service workers in need of low- to moderate-income housing.

**Table 5 Population Projections by Ethnicity  
Mono County, 2010-2030**

	2010	2020	2030
Total Population	14,833	18,080	22,894
White	9,682	9,397	8,858
Hispanic	4,348	7,805	13,106
Asian	175	195	211
Pacific Islander	10	10	10
Black	69	69	69
American Indian	303	338	342
Multirace	246	266	298

Source: California Department of Finance, Report P-3.

**Table 6 Total Population by Race, by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>White Alone</b>	<b>Black Alone</b>	<b>Am. Indian Alone</b>	<b>Asian Alone</b>	<b>Pacific Islander Alone</b>	<b>Other Race Alone</b>	<b>2+ Races</b>
Antelope Valley	1,255	24	110	20	1	61	54
Bridgeport Valley	607	5	39	11	0	35	7
Mono Basin	365	3	38	5	0	78	7
June Lake	546	0	12	4	0	45	6
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	1,342	0	14	12	0	64	35
Tri-Valley	801	0	61	1	1	63	27
Total Unincorporated Area	4,916	32	274	53	2	346	136
(Percent of Total Pop.)	85.4%	0.5%	4.8%	0.9%	< 1%	6.0%	2.4%

Sources: U.S. Census 2000, SF1:P3.

## AGE

The median age in the unincorporated area increased from 33 in 1990 (1990 Census) to 40.1 in 2000 (Table 7). The majority of the population in the unincorporated area remains in the 18-64 age group, 65 percent in 2000, 63 percent in 1990 (Table 8). The number of children under 5 decreased from 8 percent of the unincorporated population in 1990 to 6 percent in 2000, a 25-percent decrease in that age group. The number of seniors 65 years and older increased from 10 percent of the unincorporated population in 1990 to 12 percent in 2000, a 32-percent increase in that age group.

Antelope Valley had the highest percentage of children under 5, most of them west of U.S. 395, probably in the Marine Corps housing in Coleville (Tables 9A & B). Antelope Valley also had the highest percentage of seniors 65 years and older (Tables 9A & B). The Long Valley/Wheeler Crest and Tri-Valley planning areas also had high percentages of children under 5 and seniors 65 years and older (Table 9B).

**Table 7 Median Age by Sex by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>Both Sexes</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
Antelope Valley, west of U.S. 395	27.9	26.5	30.8
Antelope Valley, east of U.S. 395	47.8	46.5	49.2
Bridgeport Valley	43.4	43.8	43.0
Mono Basin	36.9	35.0	40.2
June Lake	41.4	40.0	42.4
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	41.9	42.6	40.9
Tri-Valley	42.9	43.1	42.8
Total Unincorporated Area	40.1	40.4	39.7

Sources: US Census 2000, SF1:P13, SF4:PCT 4..

**Table 8 Population by Age, Unincorporated Mono County, 1990-2000**

<b>Age Group</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>Change</b>
Under 5	436 (8%)	325 (6%)	- 111(-25%)
5-17	955 (19%)	1,034 (18%)	+79(+8%)
18-64	3,275 (63%)	3,731 (65%)	+456 (+14%)
65 & Over	505 (10%)	669 (12%)	+164 (+32%)
Total	5,171 (100%)	5,759 (100%)	+533 (+11%)

Note: Percentages for 1990 and 2000 are the percentage of the total population at that time. The percentage change is the percentage change for that age group between 1990 and 2000.

Sources: U.S. Census 2000, SF1:P12.

**Table 9A Total Population by Age, by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000  
(Percentage of Total Population in Each Group)**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>Under 5</b>	<b>5-17</b>	<b>18-64</b>	<b>65 &amp; Over</b>	<b>Total Pop</b>
Antelope Valley	109 (7%)	257 (17%)	925 (61%)	234 (15%)	1,525 (100%)
[Antelope Valley, west of U.S. 395]	82 (10%)	145 (17%)	527 (62%)	95 (11%)	849 (100%)
[Antelope Valley, east of U.S. 395]	27 (4%)	112 (17%)	398 (59%)	139 (21%)	676 (100%)
Bridgeport Valley	33 (5%)	114 (16%)	460 (65%)	97 (14%)	704 (100%)
Mono Basin	40 (8%)	84 (17%)	329 (66%)	43 (9%)	496 (100%)
June Lake	25 (4%)	105 (17%)	436 (71%)	47 (8%)	613 (100%)
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	70 (5%)	281 (19%)	995 (68%)	121 (8%)	1,467 (100%)
Tri-Valley	48 (5%)	193 (20%)	586 (61%)	127 (13%)	954 (100%)
Total Unincorporated Area	325 (6%)	1,034 (18%)	3,731 (65%)	669(12%)	5,759 (100%)

*Note: Percentages are the percentage of the total population in that planning area. Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding. Antelope Valley figures for east and west of U.S. 395 are provided for information; they are not included in the totals.*

*Sources: US Census 2000, SF1:P12.*

**Table 9B Total Population by Age, by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000  
(Percentage of total population in each age group)**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>Under 5</b>	<b>5-17</b>	<b>18-64</b>	<b>65 &amp; Over</b>	<b>Total Pop</b>
Antelope Valley	109 (34%)	257 (25%)	925 (25%)	234 (35%)	1,525 (26%)
[Antelope Valley, west of U.S. 395]	82 (25%)	145 (14%)	527 (14%)	95 (14%)	849 (15%)
[Antelope Valley, east of U.S. 395]	27 (8%)	112 (11%)	398 (11%)	139 (21%)	676 (12%)
Bridgeport Valley	33 (10%)	114 (11%)	460 (12%)	97 (15%)	704 (12%)
Mono Basin	40 (12%)	84 (8%)	329 (9%)	43 (6%)	496 (9%)
June Lake	25 (8%)	105 (10%)	436 (12%)	47 (7%)	613 (11%)
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	70 (22%)	281 (27%)	995 (27%)	121 (18%)	1,467 (25%)
Tri-Valley	48 (15%)	193 (19%)	586 (16%)	127 (19%)	954 (17%)
Total Unincorporated Area	325 (100%)	1,034 (100%)	3,731 (100%)	669(100%)	5,759 (100%)

*Note: Percentages are the percentage of the total population in each age group. Percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding. Antelope Valley figures for east and west of U.S. 395 are provided for information; they are not included in the totals.*

*Sources: U.S. Census 2000, SF1:P1.*

The State Department of Finance is projecting that the population in the County will age over the next twenty years, with the percent of the total County population that is elderly (65 years and over) rising from 11.6 percent in 2010 to 17.5 percent of the total in 2030 (see Table 10). The percentage of those 19 and under will rise slightly, while those aged 20-64 will decline from 65 percent of the total population in 2010 to 54.8 percent in 2030. It is difficult to know what percentage of these age groups will live in the unincorporated area.

**Table 10      Population Projections by Age  
Mono County, 2010-2030**

	2010	2020	2030
Total Population	14,833	18,080	22,894
Under 5	879	1,295	1,750
5-19	2,578	3,159	4,583
20-64	9,643	10,762	12,554
65 and Over	1,733	2,864	4,007

*Source: California Department of Finance, Report P-3.*



# HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

## HOUSEHOLD GROWTH

The total number of households is estimated to be 2,406 in 2003 (California Department of Finance Report E-5), an increase of 84 households (4 percent) since 2000, or 28 households per year. Between 1990 and 2000, the greatest increase in households occurred in the Long Valley/Wheeler Crest planning area with an increase of 166 households (37 percent) (Table 11). The Antelope Valley experienced the second highest growth rate, with an increase of 76 houses (15 percent) (Table 11).

Average household size for the unincorporated area in Mono County decreased slightly from 2.51 in 1990 to 2.40 in 2000 (Table 12). Antelope Valley west of U.S. 395 and the Tri-Valley had the highest average household sizes, with 2.60 persons per household and 2.54 persons/household, respectively (Table 12). Bridgeport Valley and Antelope Valley east of U.S. 395 had the lowest average household sizes, with 2.27 persons/household and 2.28 persons per household, respectively (Table 12).

**Table 11 Households by Planning Area, Mono County, 1990-2000**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>1990 Households</b>	<b>2000 Households</b>	<b>Numerical Change</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>	<b>Annual Change</b>
Antelope Valley	507	583	76	15%	8
Bridgeport Valley	286	295	9	3%	< 1
Mono Basin	170	191	21	12%	2
June Lake	251	264	13	5%	1
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	448	614	166	37%	17
Tri-Valley	347	375	28	8%	3
Total Unincorporated Area	2,009	2,322	313	16%	31

Sources: U.S. Census 1990, SF1:P003, U.S. Census 2000, SF1:P15 and SF4:PCT6.

## HOUSEHOLD TENURE

The overall number of renters in the unincorporated area decreased from 40 percent of all households in 1990 to 31 percent of all households in 2000 (Table 14). Between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of households that were renters remained fairly constant in Antelope Valley and June Lake, while the percentage of households that were renters decreased slightly in Bridgeport Valley and Tri-Valley (Table 14). During that period, the percentage of households that were renters decreased significantly in Mono Basin and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest (Table 14).

Between 1990 and 2000, the number of renters in single-family residences in the unincorporated area decreased from 533 housing units to 406 units, the number in multiple-family residences increased from 118 housing units to 185 units, and the number

in mobile homes increased from 120 housing units to 132 units (Table 13). There is no consistent pattern of change in the type of rental units throughout the County's planning areas during this period. Increases and decreases in each type of rental unit occur throughout the County. The Long Valley/Wheeler Crest area showed the largest decrease in single-family rentals (124 units to 30 units) while the Antelope Valley showed the largest increase in multiple family rentals (0 units to 71 units) with the completion of 71 units at the Marine Corps housing site in Coleville (Table 13). Antelope Valley also showed the largest increase in mobile-home rentals (45 units to 73 units) (Table 13).

**Table 12 Average Household Size by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>Average Household Size</b>
Antelope Valley, west of U.S. 395	2.60 persons/household
Antelope Valley, east of U.S. 395	2.28 persons/household
Bridgeport Valley	2.27 persons/household
Mono Basin	2.59 persons/household
June Lake	2.32 persons/household
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	2.39 persons/household
Tri-Valley	2.54 persons/household
Total Unincorporated Area	2.40 persons/household
Total Unincorporated Area 1990	2.51 persons/household

Sources: U.S. Census 2000, SF1:P17.

**Table 13 Renters by Housing Type by Planning Area, 1990-2000**

Planning Area	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
	SFR	SFR	MFR	MFR	MH	MH
Antelope Valley	195	97	0	71	45	73
Bridgeport Valley	73	98	29	24	15	0
Mono Basin	42	20	13	28	20	0
June Lake	44	57	11	22	9	7
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	124	30	52	40	0	11
Tri-Valley	55	44	13	0	31	41
Total Unincorporated Area	533	406	118	185	120	132

Notes: SFR = single-family residence; MFR = multifamily residence. In 1990, 9 renters in Antelope Valley, 3 in Bridgeport, 16 in June Lake, and 12 in the Tri-Valley lived in something other than SFR, MFR, or a mobile home. In 2000, this category was identified as Boat, RV, Van, etc. and there were no renters anywhere in the County living in that type of structure.

Sources: U.S. Census 1990, SF3:H22, U.S. Census 2000, SF3:H32.

**Table 14 Household Tenure by Planning Area, Mono County, 1990-2000**

Planning Area	1990	1990	Total	2000	2000	Total
	Renters	Owners		Renters	Owners	
Antelope Valley	249 (50%)	253 (50%)	502 (100%)	301 (50%)	302 (50%)	603(100%)
Bridgeport Valley	120 (42%)	165 (58%)	285(100%)	122 (39%)	189 (61%)	311(100%)
Mono Basin	75 (45%)	91 (55%)	166(100%)	48 (26%)	135 (74%)	183(100%)
June Lake	80 (35%)	146 (65%)	226(100%)	86 (34%)	166 (66%)	252(100%)
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	188 (40%)	277 (60%)	465(100%)	81 (14%)	515 (86%)	596(100%)
Tri-Valley	99 (27%)	266 (73%)	365(100%)	85 (23%)	292 (77%)	377(100%)
Total Unincorporated Area	811 (40%)	1,198 (60%)	2,009(100%)	723 (31%)	1,599 (69%)	2,322(100%)

Note: Percentages are the percentage of renters/owners in each planning area.

Sources: U.S. Census 1990, SF3:H008; U.S. Census 2000, SF3:H7 H7.

## OCCUPANCY STATUS

In Mono County, the unincorporated area had a vacancy rate of 39 percent in 2000, down from 44 percent in 1990 (Table 15). This unusually high rate reflects the large number of vacation homes and seasonal use units in the area, many of which remain vacant for the majority of the year. In 2000, the vacancy rate in the unincorporated area for rentals was 3 percent, while the vacancy rate for units for sale was 6 percent (Table 15). Eighty-four percent of the vacant units were seasonal or recreational use units, while 7 percent of the vacant units were vacant for other reasons (including units rented or sold but not occupied and units reserved for migrant workers) (Table 15).

When the census was taken in 2000, only Antelope Valley, Long Valley/Wheeler Crest, and Tri-Valley had units available for rent (Table 16). All of the planning areas except Mono Basin had units available for sale, with the most units available in June Lake and Tri-Valley (Table 16). Mono Basin and June Lake had the highest percentages of vacant units reserved for seasonal use, 100 percent and 95 percent, respectively, while Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley had the lowest percentages of vacant units reserved for seasonal use, 51 percent and 55 percent, respectively (Table 16).

**Table 15 Vacancy Status, Unincorporated Mono County, 1990-2000**

<b>Vacancy Status</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>Change</b>
Total Housing Units	3,562	3,791	+ 229
Total Units Occupied	2,009	2,322	+ 313
Total Units Vacant	1,553 (44%)	1,469 (39%)	- 84
(percentage above is the overall vacancy rate for that year)			
Total Units Vacant	1,553 (100%)	1,469 (100%)	- 84
Vacant Units for rent	99 (6%)	38 (3%)	- 66
Vacant Units for sale	40 (3%)	88 (6%)	+ 48
Vacant Units for seasonal use	1,178 (76%)	1,235 (84%)	+ 57
Vacant Units for other use	236 (15%)	108 (7%)	- 128
(percentages above are the percentage of vacant units in each year that are vacant for rent, etc.)			

Sources: U.S. Census 1990. U.S. Census 2000, SF3: H6 and H8.

**Table 16 Vacancy Status by Planning Area, Unincorporated Mono County, 2000**

<b>Vacancy Status</b>	<b>Antelope Valley</b>	<b>Bridgeport Valley</b>	<b>Mono Basin</b>	<b>June Lake</b>	<b>Long Valley Wheeler</b>	<b>Tri-Valley</b>
Total Housing Units	726	686	253	727	889	510
Total Units Occupied	603	311	183	252	596	377
Total Units Vacant	123 (17%)	375 (55%)	70 (28%)	475 (65%)	293 (33%)	133 (26%)
(percentage in line above is percentage of units that are vacant in that planning area)						
Total Units Vacant	123 (100%)	375 (100%)	70 (100%)	475 (100%)	293 (100%)	133 (100%)
Vacant Units for rent	10 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	19 (6%)	9 (7%)
Vacant Units for sale	10 (8%)	17 (5%)	0 (0%)	23 (5%)	2 (<1%)	36 (27%)
Vacant Units for seasonal use	63 (51%)	318 (85%)	70 (100%)	452 (95%)	259 (88%)	73 (55%)
Vacant Units for other use	40 (33%)	40 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (4%)	15 (11%)
(percentages above are the percentage of vacant units in each planning area that are vacant for rent, etc.)						

*Note: In the "Vacant for Other Use" category, 38 units in Bridgeport were rented or sold but not occupied, 1 unit in Long Valley/Wheeler Crest was rented or sold but not occupied, and 3 units in Tri-Valley were rented or sold but not occupied. Ten units in Tri-Valley were for migrant workers.*

*Sources: U.S. Census 1990. U.S. Census 2000, SF3: H6 and H8.*

## **OVERCROWDED HOUSEHOLDS**

The U.S. Census Bureau defines an overcrowded household as a housing unit occupied by more than one person per room (not including kitchens and bathrooms). Units with more than 1.51 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded and indicate a significant housing need.

Overcrowding is not a significant housing situation in unincorporated Mono County. In 2000, there were 125 overcrowded households, 5.4 percent of the total households (2,322) in the unincorporated area (Table 17). The statewide overcrowding rate for households in 2000 was 15.2 percent of all households (HCD, Mono County Housing Template, Table 5).

Of the 125 overcrowded households, 32 percent were renters, approximately the same percentage as the overall rate for renters in the unincorporated area (renters = 31 percent of all households in 2000). This does not indicate a disproportionate overcrowded situation for renters. Overcrowded renter households represented 5.5 percent of all renter households in the unincorporated area in 2000, significantly less than the statewide overcrowding rate for renters of 23.9 percent in 2000 (HCD, Mono County Housing Template, Table 5).

Less than 3 percent of all households in the unincorporated area were severely overcrowded in 2000. Of the 67 households identified as being severely overcrowded, 57 of them were owner households, and only 10 were renter households.

**Table 17 Overcrowded Households by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>Owners</b>			<b>Renters</b>		
	<b>1-1.5 Persons</b>	<b>1.51+ Persons</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>1-1.5 Persons</b>	<b>1.51+ Persons</b>	<b>Total</b>
Antelope Valley	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bridgeport Valley	0	11	11	12	0	12
Mono Basin	0	7	7	0	10	10
June Lake	5	7	12	0	0	0
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	17	8	25	0	0	0
Tri-Valley	6	24	32	18	0	18
Total Unincorporated Area	28	57	85	30	10	40

Total Overcrowded Households = 125 (85 owners + 40 renters)      Total 1.51+ Persons Per Room = 67 (57 owners + 10 renters)

Total 1-1.5 Persons Per Room = 58 (28 owners + 30 renters)

Sources: U.S. Census 2000, SF3:H20..



## EXTREMELY LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

Extremely low-income households are those with income less than 30 percent of the area's median income. Mono County's median income in 2008 was \$65,900. Income limits are adjusted depending on the number of people in the household. For a four-person household, the current income limit for an extremely low-income household is \$19,750. For a one-person household, the income limit is \$13,850.

Households with extremely low income may have a variety of housing needs. In Mono County, households receiving assistance through the CalWORKS program, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), or disability income may be considered extremely low-income households. Mono County also has a large population of service workers earning minimum wage who may fall into the extremely low-income category, depending on the number of workers in a household. The California Economic Development Department provides Occupational Employment Statistics for the Eastern Sierra Region showing wages for a variety of occupations, i.e.:

<b>Table 18 Occupational Employment Statistics, Mono County, 2008</b>		
<b>Occupational Title</b>	<b>Median Hourly Wage 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2008</b>	<b>Median Annual Wage*</b>
Fast Food Workers	\$8.52	\$17,721
Waiters and Waitresses	\$8.42	\$17,514
Dishwashers	\$8.55	\$17,784
Maids and Housekeeping Cleaners	\$9.39	\$19,531
Hotel, Motel, and Resort Desk Clerks	\$9.57	\$19,906

\* Based on working 40 hours per week, 52 weeks per year.

Source: California Employment Development Department (EDD), Occupational Employment and Wage Data, Occupational Employment Statistics Survey.

Data on the number of extremely-low income households in the County are available through HUD's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), which utilizes census data from 2000. In 2000, there were approximately 229 extremely-low income households in the unincorporated area, 7.5 percent of the total number of households. Fifty-one percent of the extremely-low income households were renters; 41 percent were homeowners. The households renting comprised a variety of household types, elderly, small and large related households, and small and large non-related households. The homeowners were predominantly elderly (74 percent of extremely-low income homeowners), with the remaining 26 percent being households with 2-4 relatives.

It should be noted that CHAS data are compiled utilizing a special rounding scheme on special tabulation data. This results in a discrepancy between the CHAS data and data taken directly from census files (such as SF3).

**Table 19 ELI Households, Housing Statistics by Tenure, Mono County, 2000**

	<b>Renters</b>	<b>Owners</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total Number of ELI Households	135	94	229
Percent with Housing Problem	82%	63%	75%
Percent with Cost Burden (>30% of Income)	80%	63%	73%
Percent with Severe Cost Burden (> 50% of Income)	74%	47%	63%

Source: HUD, Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), May 2004

A large percentage of ELI households face housing problems, with the majority of those paying more than 30 percent of household income towards housing costs. Sixty-three percent of ELI households pay more than 50 percent of their income towards housing costs, compared to 12 percent of all households.

**Table 20 ELI Households/All Households, Housing Statistics, Mono County, 2000**

	<b>ELI Households</b>	<b>Total Households</b>
Number of Households	229	2,323
Percent with Housing Problem	75%	33%
Percent with Cost Burden (>30% of Income)	73%	28%
Percent with Severe Cost Burden (> 50% of Income)	63%	12%

Source: HUD, Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), May 2004

## **HOUSEHOLDS OVERPAYING**

Households are considered to be overpaying for housing if payments for rent or mortgage are 30 percent or more of household income. The number of lower-income households (those at or below 80 percent of the median income) overpaying is of special concern. In 1999, the median household income for unincorporated Mono County was \$45,325 (US Census 2000, Summary File 4, Table PCT 89). Eighty percent of the median household income is \$36,260; the closest category available in the census data is \$35,000.

In 2000, there were approximately 505 households (22% of all households) in the unincorporated area of Mono County paying 30 percent or more of their household income for housing (Table 21). Twenty-eight percent of all renter-occupied households were overpaying; 19 percent of all owner-occupied households were overpaying (Table 21). Of the 585 households reporting a household income less than \$35,000, 305 (44 percent of households with income less than \$35,000 or 13 percent of all households) were overpaying, including all renter-occupied households with income less than \$35,000 (Table 21).

In individual planning areas, June Lake had the highest rate of overpayment with 38 percent of all households overpaying (Table 21). Long Valley/Wheeler Crest had the second highest rate of overpayment with 28 percent (Table 21). In both planning areas, there were a substantial number of homeowners with incomes greater than \$35,000 who were overpaying. Rates of overpayment for the other planning areas were 18 percent of all households in Antelope Valley, 21 percent in Bridgeport Valley, 14 percent in Mono Basin, and 10 percent in Tri-Valley.

**Table 21 Households Overpaying by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>Owners</b>	<b>Renters</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Antelope Valley</b>			
Households with Income Less than \$35,000	37	185	295
Households Overpaying with Income Less than \$35,000	37	73	110
Total Households Overpaying	37	73	110
<b>Bridgeport Valley</b>			
Households with Income Less than \$35,000	19	78	97
Households Overpaying with Income Less than \$35,000	0	36	36
Total Households Overpaying	30	36	66
<b>Mono Basin</b>			
Households with Income Less than \$35,000	19	9	28
Households Overpaying with Income Less than \$35,000	19	0	19
Total Households Overpaying	26	0	26
<b>June Lake</b>			
Households with Income Less than \$35,000	20	56	76
Households Overpaying with Income Less than \$35,000	12	56	68
Total Households Overpaying	40	56	96
<b>Long Valley/Wheeler Crest</b>			
Households with Income Less than \$35,000	56	40	96
Households Overpaying with Income Less than \$35,000	32	27	59
Total Households Overpaying	142	27	169
<b>Tri-Valley</b>			
Households with Income Less than \$35,000	17	49	66
Households Overpaying with Income Less than \$35,000	0	13	13
Total Households Overpaying	25	13	38
<b>Total Unincorporated Area</b>			
Households with Income Less than \$35,000	168	417	585
Households Overpaying with Income Less than \$35,000	100	205	305
Total Households Overpaying	300	205	505

*Notes: Number of households overpaying based on the number of households (1,451 total; 514 renter and 937 owner) computed by the Census.*

*Sources: U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3, Tables H69, H73, H94 and H97.*

# EMPLOYMENT, INCOME & POVERTY

---

## OVERALL EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

The following discussion of employment trends in Mono County is excerpted from **Eastern Sierra Region Projection Highlights** (Alpine, Inyo, and Mono Counties) prepared by the California Employment Development Department ([www.labormarkerinfo.edd.ca.gov](http://www.labormarkerinfo.edd.ca.gov)).

### Industry

Total employment, including Self-Employment, Unpaid Family Workers, Farm Employment and Nonfarm Wage and Salary Employment in the Eastern Sierra Region is expected to grow about 1.6 percent annually between 2004 and 2014. Employment is anticipated to increase by almost 2,800 total jobs to about 20,200 jobs in 2014. The projected growth rate for this three-County area is equal to the growth rate of California, which is about 1.6 percent annually.

Nonfarm Wage and Salary Employment, which accounts for 91 percent of total employment, is expected to grow 1.7 percent annually for the next ten years in the Eastern Sierra Region. Six out of ten new jobs are forecasted to occur in Government (800), Leisure and Hospitality (440), and Retail Trade (380).

### Occupations

Occupational projections for the period 2004 to 2014 forecast:

- 2,740 new jobs from industry growth,
- 4,620 jobs openings from Net Replacements,
- A combined total of 7,360 job openings.

The top 50 occupations with the most job openings will generate 65 percent of all job openings in the Eastern Sierra Region during the 2004-2014 projections period, accounting for almost 4,800 total job openings. Of the top 50 occupations with the most job openings, 41 require work experience or on-the-job training. Food preparation and Office and Administrative Support account for 18 of the 50 occupations with the most job openings.

The 32 fastest growing occupations are all expected to grow at an annual rate of 1.6 percent or more. Of the 32 fastest growing jobs, 27 require work experience or on-the-job training. There are seven occupations in Construction scattered throughout the top 32 fastest growing occupations.

## EMPLOYMENT TRENDS UNINCORPORATED AREA

Employment trends for the unincorporated area vary from the County as a whole, with higher percentages in agriculture, construction and mining (particularly mining), manufacturing, transportation and public utilities, and services, and lower percentages in wholesale trade, retail trade, finance, insurance, real estate, and government (Table 22). In the unincorporated area, between 1990 and 2000, employment declined in agriculture, mining, manufacturing, finance, insurance and real estate, other services, and public administration (Table 23). During that period, employment remained stable in construction, transportation and utilities, and professional services while it increased in wholesale trade, retail trade, information, educational and health services, and arts, recreation, accommodation and food services (Table 23).

**Table 22      Employment by Industry, Mono County**

	<u>Total Mono County</u>	<u>Unincorporated Area</u>
Agriculture	0.2%	4.0%
Construction and Mining	6.2%	17.4%
Manufacturing	1.1%	3.4%
Wholesale Trade	0.3%	0.0%
Retail Trade	25.7%	10.5%
Finance, Insurance, Real Estate	7.9%	2.9%
Transportation, Public Utilities	1.8%	3.7%
Services	35.7%	47.1%
Government	21.8%	8.7%

*Sources: County Profile: Mono 2002; U.S. Census 2000, SF:P49.*

Employment data for March, 2009, from the Employment Development Department show the following current employment by industry (not seasonally adjusted):

Total Wage and Salary	7,350
Leisure and Hospitality	3,990
Government	1,600
Trade, Transportation and Utilities	590
Retail Trade	500
Goods Producing	350
Financial Activities	310
Professional and Business Services	240
Transportation, Warehousing and Utilities	80
Educational and Health Services	50
Manufacturing	40
Farm	20
Wholesale Trade	10

## MAJOR EMPLOYERS IN MONO COUNTY

The following list of major employers in Mono County was developed using the 2009 America's Labor Market Information System Employer Database (California Employment Development Department, [www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov](http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov)). Many of these employers are located in Mammoth Lakes, a significant commute from many areas of the County.

<u>Employer Name</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Industry</u>
Eastern Sierra Unified School Dist	Various	Schools
June Mountain Ski Area	June Lake	Hotels & Motels
Juniper Springs Resort	June Lakes	Resort
Mammoth Hospital	Mammoth Lakes	Hospitals
Mammoth Lakes Fire Dept	Mammoth Lakes	Misc. Business
Mammoth Mountain Inn	Mammoth Lakes	Hotels & Motels
Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	Mammoth Lakes	Hotels & Motels
Mono County Government	Bridgeport	Local government
Town of Mammoth Lakes	Mammoth Lakes	Local government
US Forest Service	Various	Federal government
Vons	Mammoth Lakes	Retail
Westin-Monache Resort	Mammoth Lakes	Hotels and motels

**Table 23 Employment by Industry, Unincorporated Mono County, Civilian Population 16 and Older, 2000**

Industry Type	1990		2000	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting and mining	275	10.8%	160	5.6%
Construction	389	15.3%	449	15.8%
Manufacturing	79	3.1%	101	3.4%
Wholesale trade	25	0.9%	0	0.0%
Retail trade	392	15.4%	297	10.5%
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	99	3.9%	105	3.7%
Information	0	0.0%	61	2.1%
Finance, insurance, real estate and rental and leasing	145	5.7%	83	2.9%
Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services	140	5.5%	169	5.6%
Educational, health and social services	263	10.3%	545	19.1%
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services	393	15.5%	549	19.3%
Other services	84	3.3%	75	2.6%
Public administration	258	10.1%	246	8.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,542</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,840</b>	<b>100%</b>

*Source: U.S. Census 1990, SF3:P077; U.S. Census 2000, SF3:P 49.*

## **PLACE OF WORK**

Many County residents do not work in the community in which they live. Approximately 25 percent (729 persons) of workers 16 and older residing in unincorporated Mono County worked outside the County and outside the state in 2000 (Table 24). Mono County workers who worked outside the state lived predominantly in Antelope Valley; almost one quarter of Antelope Valley workers worked outside the state, in Douglas County and Carson City. The highest numbers of those who worked outside Mono County but in California lived in Long Valley/Wheeler Crest and Tri-Valley; approximately 17 percent of Long Valley workers and 71 percent of Tri-Valley workers worked outside the County, with large numbers commuting to Inyo County. Twenty percent of Mono Basin workers and 15 percent of June Lake workers also worked outside Mono County. This indicates that there is a significant jobs/housing imbalance in Mono County.

Travel times to work are highest in Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley, reflecting the fact that many residents of those areas work outside the community (Table 25). A large number of Long Valley/Wheeler Crest workers commute between 30 and 44 minutes, probably to Bishop or other points in Inyo County.

Mono County's economy is dominated by services, retail trade and government. Industry projections from the California Employment Development Department for the Eastern Sierra Region estimate that job growth in the area between 2004 and 2014 will be strongest in Leisure and Hospitality Services, Government, Retail Trade, and Trade, Transportation and Utilities. Major job centers are located in Mammoth Lakes (services, retail trade, government), June Lake (seasonal services and retail trade) and Bridgeport (government). Despite the availability of Commercial (C) and Mixed Use (MU) zoning throughout communities in the unincorporated area, it is unlikely that sufficient jobs will develop to eliminate the need for workers to commute to jobs outside their communities.

## **INCOME**

The overall median household income in the unincorporated area in 1999 was \$45,325 (US Census 2000, Summary File 4, Table PCT 89). The median household income varied significantly, however, throughout the County depending on the area and the age of the householder (see Table 26), with the southern half of the County having generally higher overall income levels. The median income for Mono County in 2008 was \$65,900 (HCD, 2008 income limits).

Mono County residents in the unincorporated area had income from a variety of sources in 1999 (Table 27). Self-employment income was highest in June Lake and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest. Income from investments (interest, dividends, rentals) was highest in Long Valley/Wheeler Crest, June Lake and Mono Basin. Social Security income was highest in Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley. Supplemental Security income was highest in Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley, while Public Assistance income was highest in Mono Basin and June Lake. Income from retirement funds was highest in Tri-Valley and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest.

## **POVERTY**

The total number of persons with income below poverty level in the unincorporated area decreased from 563 in 1989 to 438 in 1999 (Table 28). The number of persons with income below poverty level decreased for all age groups, except 18-64 years old, which increased from 282 to 292 persons, and in all planning areas except June Lake, which increased from 30 to 39 persons and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest, which increased from 19 to 38 persons (Table 28).

The total number of families in the unincorporated area with an income below poverty level also decreased from 100 in 1989 to 67 in 1999 (Table 29). The number of families with an income below poverty level decreased for all family types, except for female-headed households with children, which increased from 8 families to 33, and in all planning areas except June Lake, which increased from eight to 11 families, and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest, which increased from 25 to 36 families (Table 29). The increases in June Lake and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest were primarily the result of increases in female-headed households with children with incomes below poverty level (Table 29).



**Table 24 Place of Work for Workers 16 & Older by Planning Area, Unincorporated Mono County, 2000**

<b>Place of Work</b>	<b>Antelope Valley</b>	<b>Bridgeport Valley</b>	<b>Mono Basin</b>	<b>June Lake</b>	<b>Long Valley Wheeler</b>	<b>Tri-Valley</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total	768	370	261	335	757	387	2,878
Worked in State of Residence	598	370	255	330	757	385	2,695
Worked in County of Residence	557	370	202	280	629	111	2,149
Worked Outside County of Residence	41	0	53	50	128	274	546
Worked Outside State of Residence	170	0	6	5	0	2	183

Sources: U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3, Table P 26.

**Table 25 Travel Time to Work, Workers 16 & Older by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000**

<b>Place of Work</b>	<b>Antelope Valley</b>	<b>Bridgeport Valley</b>	<b>Mono Basin</b>	<b>June Lake</b>	<b>Long Valley Wheeler</b>	<b>Tri-Valley</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total	768	370	261	335	757	387	2,878 (11%)
Worked at Home	27	28	39	29	58	29	210 (7.2%)
Less than 30 minutes	380	282	179	220	521	210	1,792 (62.2%)
30 to 44 minutes	249	47	13	57	158	70	594 (20.6%)
45 to 59 minutes	65	2	16	21	15	17	136 (4.7%)
60 or more minutes	47	11	14	8	5	61	146 (5.1%)

Sources: U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3, Tables P 31 and P32.

**Table 26 Median Household Income by Age by Planning Area, Mono County, 1999 (dollars)**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>Householder Age Group</b>						
	<b>under 25 yrs</b>	<b>25-34 yrs</b>	<b>35-44 yrs</b>	<b>45-54 yrs</b>	<b>55-64 yrs</b>	<b>65-74 yrs</b>	<b>75+ yrs</b>
Antelope Valley, west of 395	26,250	31,477	67,500	26,852	8,750	43,750	43,654
Antelope Valley, east of 395	0	21,597	27,070	64,375	39,018	80,109	11,406
Bridgeport Valley	0	50,227	44,010	35,577	36,713	21,346	90,957
Mono Basin	0	0	49,167	44,688	45,250	87,500	11,250
June Lake	36,607	47,143	24,306	72,875	49,357	19,896	0
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	58,750	38,750	50,938	72,039	52,692	51,563	26,875
Tri-Valley	0	26,667	53,750	49,107	50,139	29,239	30,000

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>Total</b>
Antelope Valley, west of 395	31,125
Antelope Valley, east of 395	38,929
Bridgeport Valley	36,281
Mono Basin	45,500
June Lake	48,214
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	54,597
Tri-Valley	40,278

*Sources: U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3, Table P56: Median Household Income in 1999 (Dollars) by Age of Householder.*

**Table 27 Type of Household Income by Planning Area, Mono County, 1999 (dollars)**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>Wage Income</b>	<b>Self-Emp. Income</b>	<b>Int./Div. Income</b>	<b>SSA Income</b>	<b>SSI Income</b>	<b>Pub. Assist Income</b>	<b>Retirement Income</b>	<b>Total #</b>
Antelope Valley, w. of 395	203/71%	42/15%	53/19%	108/38%	35/12%	0/0%	42/15%	285
Antelope Valley, e. of 395	235/84%	45/16%	107/38%	82/29%	0/0%	9/3%	46/16%	280
Bridgeport Valley	279/78%	69/19%	113/31%	54/15%	3/<1%	1/<1%	93/26%	359
Mono Basin	160/73%	44/20%	99/45%	69/32%	0/0%	10/5%	47/22%	218
June Lake	219/83%	80/30%	121/46%	34/13%	0/0%	16/6%	22/8%	264
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	428/77%	156/28%	313/56%	103/19%	2/<1%	0/0%	100/18%	556
Tri-Valley	273/73%	54/14%	129/34%	131/35%	28/7%	6/2%	111/30%	374

Notes: Self-Emp. = Self Employment Income

SSI = Supplemental Security Income

Int./Div. = Interest, Dividend, or Net Rental Income

Pub. Assist. = Public Assistance Income

SSA = Social Security Income

Households may have more than one type of income. Percentages are the percentage of total households in that planning area with a specific type of income.

Sources: U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3, Tables P59, P60, P61, P62, P63, P64, P65, P66.

**Table 28 Persons with Income Below Poverty Level, by Planning Areas, Mono County, 1989 and 1999**

<b>Age Group</b>	<b>Antelope Valley 1989/1999</b>	<b>Bridgeport Valley 1989/1999</b>	<b>Mono Basin 1989/1999</b>	<b>June Lake 1989/1999</b>	<b>Long Valley Wheeler 1989/1999</b>	<b>Tri-Valley 1989/1999</b>	<b>Total Population 1989/1999</b>
Under 5 years	54/8	12/3	0/0	0/19	0/0	18/20	84/50
5-17 years	67/38	8/2	11/0	0/9	0/8	31/21	117/78
18-64 years	127/160	19/33	9/11	30/11	13/30	84/47	282/292
65 + years	50/18	9/0	0/0	0/0	6/0	15/0	80/18
Total persons	298/224	48/38	20/11	30/39	19/38	148/88	563/438

Sources: U.S. Census 1990, Summary Tape File 3, Table 117; U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3, Table P87.

**Table 29 Families with Income Below Poverty Level, by Planning Areas, Mono County, 1989 and 1999**

<b>Family Type</b>	<b>Antelope Valley 1989/1999</b>	<b>Bridgeport Valley 1989/1999</b>	<b>Mono Basin 1989/1999</b>	<b>June Lake 1989/1999</b>	<b>Long Valley Wheeler 1989/1999</b>	<b>Tri-Valley 1989/1999</b>	<b>Total Population 1989/1999</b>
Married couple							
With children	15/5	4/0	7/0	8/0	14/4	4/11	52/20
No children	10/14	3/0	0/0	0/0	13/0	11/0	37/14
Male householder							
With children	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
No children	0/0	3/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	3/0
Female householder							
With children	0/17	0/1	8/0	0/11	0/0	0/4	8/33
No children	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0
Total families	25/36	10/1	15/0	8/11	27/4	15/15	100/67

Sources: U.S. Census 1990, Summary Tape File 3, Table 125; U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3, Table P90.

## HOUSING STOCK CHARACTERISTICS

### HOUSING TYPES

Housing in unincorporated Mono County is predominantly single-family detached units and mobile homes. Since 1990, all types of housing in the unincorporated area increased except for single-family attached units and mobile homes (Table 30). During that period, multifamily units had the greatest percentage increase, particularly two- to four-unit developments, which grew 68.2 percent (120 units) from 1990-2000 (Table 30).

**Table 30 Housing Units by Type, Unincorporated Mono County, 1990-2000**

Housing Unit Type	1990		2000		Change	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Single-family-Detached	2,267	63.7%	2,468	65.1%	+ 201	+ 8.8%
Single-family-Attached	214	6.0%	210	5.5%	- 4	- 1.9%
2-4 units	176	4.9%	296	7.8%	+ 120	+ 68.2%
5 Plus Units	63	1.8%	74	2.0%	+ 11	+ 17.5%
Mobile home	842	23.6%	743	19.5%	- 99	+ 11.8%
TOTAL	3,562	100%	3,791	100%	+ 229	+ 6.4%

*Notes: Mobile home includes "Other" (i.e.: Boat, RV, van, etc.). The majority are mobile homes.*

*Sources: U.S. Census 2000, SF3, Table H30 and U.S. Census 1990, SF 3, Table H20.*

**Table 31 Housing Units by Type by Planning Area, Mono County, 1990-2000**

<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>SFR-detached 1990/2000</b>	<b>SFR-attached 1990/2000</b>	<b>2-4 Units 1990/2000</b>	<b>5+ Units 1990/2000</b>	<b>Mobile home 1990/2000</b>	<b>Total 1990/2000</b>
Antelope Valley	394/353	67/71	11/62	12/9	222/231	706/726
Bridgeport Valley	501/506	10/19	24/81	11/0	114/80	660/686
Mono Basin	180/195	0/0	13/28	6/0	78/30	277/253
June Lake	480/480	90/69	52/85	0/38	65/55	687/727
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	484/655	47/51	63/40	31/27	154/116	779/889
Tri-Valley	228/279	0/0	13/0	3/0	209/231	453/510

*Notes: "Mobile homes" includes "Other" (i.e., boat, RV, van, etc.). The majority are mobile homes.*

*Sources: U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3, Table H30 and U.S. Census 1990, Summary File Tape 3, Table H20.*

## HOUSING STOCK CONDITIONS

The Mono County Community Development Department completed a comprehensive Housing Condition Survey for the unincorporated area of the County in the summer of 2009. The results of that survey are shown in Table 32; results are shown for conventional single family residences (SFR) as well as mobilehomes (MH). The results have been aggregated by planning area. Data for smaller community areas within the planning areas is available from the Community Development Department.

Housing units determined to be in Good Condition were in overall good condition with no repair needed. Units determined to be in Fair Condition were structurally sound but needed some minimal repair and/or paint. Units determined to be in Poor Condition were not structurally sound and needed repairs and/or paint.

**Table 32 Housing Conditions, Unincorporated Mono County, 2009**

Planning Area		Number of Housing Units		
		Good	Fair	Poor
Antelope Valley	sfr	116	128	29
	mh	<u>64</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>24</u>
	total	180	186	53
Bridgeport Valley	sfr	101	87	15
	mh	<u>19</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>7</u>
	total	120	94	22
Mono Basin	sfr	78	33	6
	mh	<u>13</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>
	total	91	35	6
June Lake	sfr	261	140	18
	mh	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	total	265	141	19
Long Valley	sfr	495	102	5
	mh	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
	total	497	103	5
Tri-Valley	sfr	90	63	14
	mh	<u>143</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>32</u>
	total	233	133	46
Total	sfr	1141	553	87
	mh	245	149	64

Source: Mono County Community Development Department, Housing Conditions Survey.

Approximately 39 percent of all housing units in the unincorporated area were built more than 30 years ago (Table 33). Twenty-one percent were built more than 40 years ago, and 13 percent were built more than 50 years ago (Table 33). Bridgeport Valley (65%) and Mono Basin (47%) have the highest percentage of housing units built more than 30 years ago, although over a third of the housing units in all planning areas except June Lake were built more than 30 years ago. Bridgeport Valley (33%), Mono Basin (22%), and Long Valley (22%) have the highest percentage of housing units built more than 40 years ago. Bridgeport Valley (22%), June Lake (14%), and Long Valley (14%) have the highest percentage of housing units built more than 50 years ago.

In Long Valley and June Lake many of the housing units built more than 40 years ago were originally constructed as seasonal cabins. Over the years, many of those units have been converted to year-round housing. In Bridgeport Valley and Mono Basin, many of the older housing units were constructed as primary residences and have been maintained as such.

In general, Mono County's housing stock is in fair to good condition. Approximately 60 percent of all housing units in the unincorporated area have been built in the past 30 years. There are areas in the County, however, where maintenance and rehabilitation of the housing stock is an issue. Funding is available from the CDBG Rehabilitation Loan Program. Specific programs provide funds for single-family home repair loans, emergency repair and accessibility grants, exterior enhancement rebates, weatherization and home security grants for seniors, and a multifamily rehabilitation loan program.

<b>Table 33 Age of Housing by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000</b>						
<b>Year Built</b>	<b>Antelope Valley</b>	<b>Bridgeport Valley</b>	<b>Mono Basin</b>	<b>June Lake</b>	<b>Long Valley Wheeler</b>	<b>Tri Valley</b>
10 years or less	210/29%	60/9%	57/23%	321/44%	216/24%	157/31%
11-20 years	168/23%	25/4%	19/8%	106/15%	236/27%	89/17%
21-30 years	92/13%	156/23%	57/23%	126/17%	129/15%	107/21%
31-40 years	136/19%	222/32%	63/25%	45/6%	113/13%	103/20%
41-50 years	63/9%	73/11%	26/10%	25/3%	73/8%	28/5%
51 + years	57/8%	150/22%	31/12%	104/14%	122/14%	26/5%
Total Units	726/100%	686/100%	253/100%	727/100%	889/100%	510/100%

*Notes: Numbers may not equal 100 due to rounding.  
Sources: U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3, Table H34.*



## **C. SPECIAL HOUSING NEEDS**

---

### **PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

While persons with disabilities do not represent a significant portion of the population in the unincorporated area of the County, adequate housing remains an important concern. In 2000, a total of 861 persons had a disability, approximately a quarter of whom (249 persons, Table 34) were not employed, and approximately one quarter were over the age of 65 (222 persons, Table 35).

The Inyo Mono Association for the Handicapped (IMAH) serves disabled adults 18 and older, primarily with vocational training, supported employment and similar programs. The Inyo Mono Area Agency on Aging (IMAAA) contracts with the Mono County Department of Social Services to provide Mono County Senior Services (MCSS). IMAAA also operates the Linkages program in Mono County, which links vulnerable seniors and disabled adults to service in order to enhance their ability to maintain their independence. Mono County Senior Services (MCSS) delivers meals to 28 homes in Walker and serves 15 to 25 meals a day in the Walker Senior Center while 9 to 10 meals a day are delivered to the Benton area seniors. MCSS also has 3 clients under the Linkages Program and 28 under In Home Supportive Services (IHSS) to assist those clients in remaining in their homes. Other than the above, the Mono County Department of Social Services does not maintain information on how many people with disabilities they may assist. Social Services provides the following resources to people in need: CalWORKS, General Assistance, Food Stamps, Medi-Cal and/or CMSP.

Kern Regional Center serves disabled clients from Pearsonville in Kern County to Topaz in Mono County. Due to the size of its service area (16,000 square miles) and the relatively small number of clients (158 people), its services are prescriptive in nature and needs are addressed on an individual basis. They assist clients with adapting their homes and installing assistive devices but do not deal directly with housing.

The Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA) provide a variety of services for disabled, low-income, and homeless persons in Inyo and Mono counties. In unincorporated Mono County, IMACA provides help with retrofit programs (wheelchair ramps, assistive devices, etc.), home weatherization programs for low-income persons, child care, Head Start, and meals. It operates 25 low-income housing units in Mammoth Lakes as well as senior and low-income housing units in Inyo County. IMACA has Section 8 vouchers that it uses primarily for rental assistance and shelter for homeless persons.

**Table 34 Persons with Disability by Employment Status (2000) - Unincorporated Mono County**

	Number	Percent
Age 5-64, Employed Persons with a Disability	390	7.5%
Age 5-64, Not Employed Persons with a Disability	249	4.8%
Persons Age 65 Plus with a Disability	222	4.3%
Total Persons with a Disability	861	16.6%
Total Population (Civilian Non-institutional)	5,197	100.0%
Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: P42)		

**Table 35 Persons with Disabilities by Disability Type (2000) - Unincorporated Mono County**

	Number	Percent
<i>Total Disabilities Tallied</i>	<i>1349</i>	<i>100.0%</i>
<i>Total Disabilities for Ages 5-64</i>	<i>979</i>	<i>72.6%</i>
Sensory Disability	104	7.7%
Physical disability	249	18.5%
Mental disability	99	7.3%
Self-care disability	31	2.3%
Go-outside-home disability	125	9.3%
Employment disability	371	27.5%
<i>Total Disabilities for Ages 65 and Over</i>	<i>370</i>	<i>27.4%</i>
Sensory Disability	71	5.3%
Physical disability	126	9.3%
Mental disability	62	4.6%
Self-care disability	18	1.3%
Go-outside-home disability	93	6.9%
Source: Census Bureau (2000 Census SF 3: P41)		

## ELDERLY

The elderly are defined as those 65 years and older. The 2000 Census reported that 436 senior households reside in unincorporated Mono County, 18.8 percent of all households (Table 36). Of the 436 senior households, only 19 were renters, indicating a home ownership rate of 95.7 for seniors (Table 36). In addition, only 18 seniors had incomes under the poverty level in 1999 (Table 36). Home ownership is a significant hedge against the inflationary rental environment, which is probably why there are few seniors at or below the poverty level.

Site and unit size availability are generally not a problem for seniors in Mono County, due to the fact that Mono County is a rural area with the propensity for lot subdivisions rather than home subdivisions and the fact that mobile homes are permitted throughout the County on parcels zoned for single-family residences.

Due to the low number of poverty-level senior residents within the County, future needs for low-income senior households can best be addressed through rehabilitation assistance for homeowners and rent assistance for low- and moderate-income senior renters. Currently, there is no rental-assisted housing in the unincorporated areas. IMACA operates 19 units of senior housing in Bishop. Mammoth Lakes Housing operates rental-assisted housing in Mammoth Lakes, as well as low-income housing to own.

Section 202 financing, Direct Loans for Housing for the Senior or Handicapped, administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, is also available to qualified sponsors for the financing of construction of rental or cooperative housing facilities for occupancy by senior or handicapped persons.

<b>Table 36 Householders by Tenure by Age by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000</b>						
<b>Owner-Occupied Households</b>						
<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>15-24 yrs</b>	<b>25-34 yrs</b>	<b>35-64 yrs</b>	<b>65-74 yrs</b>	<b>75 + yrs</b>	<b>Total</b>
Antelope Valley	0	8	140	33	121	302
Bridgeport Valley	0	11	147	21	10	189
Mono Basin	0	0	108	16	11	135
June Lake	13	9	124	20	0	166
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	10	57	364	67	17	515
Tri-Valley	0	25	166	59	42	292
<b>Total Owners By Age</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>1,049</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>1,599</b>
<b>Renters-Occupied Households</b>						
<b>Planning Area</b>	<b>15-24 yrs</b>	<b>25-34 yrs</b>	<b>35-64 yrs</b>	<b>65-74 yrs</b>	<b>75 + yrs</b>	<b>Total</b>
Antelope Valley	9	97	195	0	0	301
Bridgeport Valley	0	24	84	14	0	122
Mono Basin	0	0	48	0	0	48
June Lake	7	27	52	0	0	86
Long Valley/Wheeler Crest	0	22	58	1	0	81
Tri-Valley	0	32	49	2	2	85
<b>Total Renters By Age</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>723</b>
<b>Total Householders by Age</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>1,535</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>2,322</b>

Sources: U.S. Census 2000, SF 3: H14.

## LARGE HOUSEHOLDS

Large households are defined as households with more than five persons. When the housing market does not meet large household housing needs, overcrowding can result. Overcrowding is not a significant housing situation in the unincorporated area of Mono County, with only 7.8 percent of all households identified as overcrowded (Table 37). Of the 180 households identified as overcrowded, 78 households (43 percent of all overcrowded households) are occupied by renters (Table 37).

Large households (five or more persons) are located throughout the County but predominantly in Antelope Valley, Long Valley and Tri-Valley (Table 38). These areas have large numbers of children and teenagers (Table 38). There are no renter-occupied large households except in Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley. Forty-six of the 52 renter-occupied households in Antelope Valley are located west of U.S. 395, probably in the Marine Corps housing at Coleville.

	1-4 persons		5+ persons		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Owner	1,497	64.5%	102	4.4%	1,599	68.9%
Renter	645	27.8%	78	3.4%	723	31.1%
Total	2,142	92.3%	180	7.8%	2,322	100%

Sources: U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3, Table H17: Tenure by Household Size.

Planning Area	Large Households		
Antelope Valley	Owners – 22	Renters – 52	Total – 74
Bridgeport Valley	Owners – 0	Renters – 0	Total – 0
Mono Basin	Owners – 7	Renters – 0	Total – 7
June Lake	Owners – 7	Renters – 0	Total – 7
Long Valley	Owners – 36	Renters – 0	Total – 36
Tri-Valley	Owners – 30	Renters – 26	Total – 56

Sources: U.S. Census 2000, Summary File 3, Table H17: Tenure by Household Size.

## FARMWORKERS

While the acreage in farms in Mono County declined between 1997 and 2007, from 68,813 acres to 44,610 acres, the number of farms increased from 63 to 84. The average size of farms decreased from 1,092 acres to 531 acres; hired farm labor decreased from 121 farmworkers on 26 farms to an undisclosed number of workers on 22 farms (Table 39 and USDA, 1997 and 2007 Census of Agriculture). Much of the census information on the number of workers is undisclosed, making it difficult to estimate the total number of farmworkers in the County. The census does indicate that 7 farms with 25 workers reported only permanent workers, 11 farms with 39 workers reported only seasonal workers, and 4 farms with an undisclosed number of workers reported utilizing both permanent and seasonal workers.

Large farm owners and ranchers in the Antelope, Bridgeport and Hammil valleys hire a limited number of farmworkers and ranch hands. Housing for most of these employees is provided on site. If this type of housing were to be eliminated, it would be difficult for farm laborers to find adequate affordable housing. The 2000 Census indicates that when the census was taken, in April 2000, there were 17 vacant units reserved for farmworkers (US Census 2000, Summary File 1, Table H5). This does not indicate how many total units were available for farmworkers.

**Table 39 Number of Farmworkers (2007) – Mono County**

<b>Hired Farm Labor</b>		
	Farms	22
	Workers	(D)
<b>Farms with 10 Workers or More</b>		
	Farms	3
	Workers	38
<i>Source: USDA 2007 Census of Farmworkers.</i>		

**Table 40 Farmworkers by Days Worked (2007) – Mono County**

<b>150 Days or More (i.e., Permanent farmworkers)</b>		
	Farms	11
	Workers	(D)
	Farms with 10 or More Workers	
	Farms	1
	Workers	(D)
<b>Fewer than 150 Days (i.e., Seasonal farmworkers)</b>		
	Farms	15
	Workers	51
	Farms with 10 or More Workers	
	Farms	1
	Workers	(D)
<i>Source: USDA 2007 Census of Farmworkers.</i>		

## FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLDS

The Census provides data on the total number of female-headed households, the number of those with children, and the number with incomes below the poverty level. The data are not provided separately by owner and renter and include all female heads of household; those without children may be supporting parents, or a single parent may be supporting an adult child or relative. Female heads of household are often the households most in need of affordable housing, childcare, job training and housing rehabilitation funds.

In unincorporated Mono County, there were 137 female-headed households in 2000 (5.9 percent of all households), down from 144 in 1990 (7.1 percent of all households in 1990) (Table 41). Of the 137 female-headed households, 33 were under the poverty level (24.0 percent of female-headed households), down from 46 in 1990 (31.9 percent of female-headed households in 1990) (Table 41). The 33 female-headed households under the poverty level represent 49.2 percent of all households under the poverty level.

Antelope Valley and June Lake have the highest numbers of female-headed households (Table 42), as well as the highest number of female-headed households under the poverty level. Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley have the highest numbers of total families under the poverty level (Table 42).

The Mono County Department of Social Services estimates that approximately 45 families in the unincorporated area with a female head of household receive assistance from CalWorks on an ongoing basis (Julie Timerman). Under this program they are eligible to receive food stamps and Medi-Cal, as well as Welfare to Work services including, but not limited to, mental health, drug and alcohol counseling, child care, and job skills. There are no direct housing assistance programs.

Female headed households with an income under the poverty level will need affordable rental housing. In Mono County, mobile homes and small multifamily units such as duplexes and triplexes, are often the most affordable.

<b>Table 41 Female-Headed Households (2000) – Unincorporated Mono County</b>		
<b>Household Type</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Female-Headed Households	137	5.9%
Female-Headed Households with Own Children	118	5.0%
Female-Headed Households without Children	19	0.8%
Total Households	2,322	100.0%
Female-Headed Households Under the Poverty Level	33	49.3%
Total Families Under the Poverty Level	67	100.0%
<i>Source: U.S. Census 2000, SF3:P90.</i>		

**Table 42 Female Headed Households by Planning Area, Mono County, 2000**

<b>Household Type</b>	<b>Antelope Valley</b>	<b>Bridgeport Valley</b>	<b>Mono Basin</b>	<b>June Lake</b>	<b>Long Valley Wheeler</b>	<b>Tri-Valley</b>
Female-Headed Households	66	13	0	36	7	15
With Own Children	53	13	0	36	7	9
Without Children	13	0	0	0	0	6
Female-Headed Households Under the Poverty Level	17	1	0	11	0	4
Total Families Under the Poverty Level	36	1	0	11	4	15

Sources: US Census 2000, SF:P10, P90.

## **EMERGENCY SHELTER NEEDS AND HOMELESS HOUSING**

The need for emergency housing encompasses a large range of situations. Families otherwise able to provide themselves with adequate housing may be suddenly and unexpectedly faced with the need for emergency shelter as a result of fire or family break-up. Families only marginally able to meet their housing needs may be left without shelter when their present housing is sold, when a shared housing arrangement breaks down, from an inability to pay rent, or a number of similar reasons. Finally, there is a transient population, composed of both families and individuals, that may have emergency shelter needs.

Mono County does not have a large homeless population, largely due to the severe winter weather conditions. The Mono County Department of Social Services estimates that they have approximately one homeless assistance case per year, usually a family displaced for a short time each year (Julie Timerman). Mono County does not have any homeless shelters, due to the low numbers of homeless persons. In addition, the social services that are provided are not concentrated in one location, making it difficult for a homeless person to utilize them, especially since there is only limited public transportation within the County.

Through the joint efforts of the Mono County Department of Social Services and the Inyo-Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA) low-income residents and transients in Mono County may be placed in a local or nearby motel on an emergency basis for up to 28 days. IMACA has 18 Section 8 vouchers that they use primarily for rental assistance and shelter for homeless persons. IMACA also operates 24 units of low-income housing in Mammoth Lakes. The Mono County Department of Social Services provides rental assistance to assist individuals with permanent housing or to keep them from being evicted, and provides food vouchers to qualified persons. Current services are adequate for the needs in the area.

In compliance with state law, the county will designate at least one land use designation where emergency shelters and transitional and supportive housing for the homeless will be allowed without a use permit or other discretionary permit. Emergency shelters will be allowed in the Public Facility (PF) land use designation and multi-family residential designations (MFR). Currently, the county has designated its community centers as emergency shelters for disaster/weather-related shelter needs. Community centers are located in the PF land use designation. As shown in Table 48, the county has a large amount of land designated with various MFR designations, with sufficient capacity to accommodate the need for emergency shelters. In compliance with state law, transitional and supportive housing will be allowed as a residential use in all land use designations where similar housing types are allowed. Transitional and supportive housing must be subject only to the restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same designation.

Emergency housing may also be a necessity during times of disaster, such as avalanches, floods, fires and earthquakes. According to the Mono County Multi-Hazard Functional Plan, prepared by the County's Office of Emergency Services, emergency housing may consist of any appropriate public or private building, depending on the size, location and nature of the disaster. Currently, each community area in Mono County has a designated Emergency Shelter, usually the community center or a church or school. Disaster shelters may be temporarily coordinated and/or funded by the American Red Cross, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the local Department of Social Services, the Sheriff's Department, and other appropriate private or quasi-public organizations. Although the California Office of Emergency Services has suggested that a permanent, year-round emergency disaster shelter may be appropriate for Mono County, the cost of building such a facility is well beyond the reach of the County's budget. Until such time as additional funding becomes available, use of community centers, federal buildings, churches and hotels/motels as evacuation centers/emergency shelters will continue in Mono County.

## **U.S. MARINE CORPS**

The Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center, located off S.R. 108 west of Sonora Junction and north of Bridgeport, maintains housing on the base and at Coleville in the Antelope Valley. There are 110 housing units at the family housing project north of Coleville in the Antelope Valley, one housing unit on the base, and 200 beds in the base barracks for single people.



## D. PROJECTED HOUSING NEEDS

### REGIONAL HOUSING NEED

The Regional Housing Need allocated to unincorporated Mono County for the period January 1, 2007 through June 30, 2014 is shown in Table 43. The income groups are defined as follows:

Very Low Income	=	0-50 percent of the area's median income (AMI)
Extremely Low Income	=	30 percent and below of the AMI
Low Income	=	51-80 percent of the area's median income
Moderate Income	=	81-120 percent of the area's median income
Above Moderate Income	=	Over 120 percent of the area's median income

The median income for Mono County in 2008 was \$65,900 (HCD, 2008 income limits). Income limits are adjusted depending on the number of people in the household.

**Table 43 Regional Housing Needs, Unincorporated Mono County, 2007-2014**

Income Group	Number	Percent
Extremely Low	29 units	9.9 %
Very Low	30 units	10.3%
Low	59 units	20.3%
Moderate	58 units	19.9%
Above Moderate	116 units	39.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>292 units</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

*Source: HCD, Regional Housing Need Plan.*

The Regional Housing Need allocated to the County by HCD included 59 units for Very Low-Income households. However, Chapter 891, Statutes of 2006, requires the quantification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs for Extremely Low-Income (ELI) households. ELI is a subset of the very low-income group and is defined as 30 percent and below of the area's median income. To calculate projected ELI housing needs, the County assumed that 50 percent of its very low-income regional housing needs are extremely low-income households. As a result, from the very low-income need of 59 allocated by HCD, the County has projected a need of 29 units for extremely low-income households.

Previously, Mono County allocated its overall regional housing needs to communities in the unincorporated area based on the percentage of the population in each community area. Due to concerns in some communities over the arbitrary nature of such an allocation, the County has decided to no longer allocate its regional housing needs to community areas. To address community concerns about the placement of housing for

low- and very low-income households in community areas, the County has amended a program in the Housing Element to require the County to utilize a variety of factors, including current and projected population figures, economic conditions, transportation systems, the potential for rehabilitation, and the availability of utilities and infrastructure, when considering the placement of affordable housing throughout the County.

Table 44 shows the number of housing units by income group built in the unincorporated portion of Mono County between January 2007 and August 2009, based on actual sales and rental prices of the units constructed. These figures were obtained from the Mono County assessor's office files for new single-family residential construction (including manufactured units/mobile homes) in the unincorporated area for the period January 2007 through August 2009.

<b>Table 44 Units Constructed or Approved, Unincorporated Mono County, January 2007 to August 2009</b>		
<b>Income Group</b>	<b># of Units Constructed</b>	<b># of Units Approved</b>
Extremely Low	0	0
Very Low	1	0
Low	12	0
Moderate	13	0
Above Moderate	42	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>0</b>
<i>Source: Mono County Community Development Department.</i>		

Table 45 shows the progress Mono County has made during 2007-2009 in meeting its regional housing need and the number of units still required in each income group to meet its identified regional housing need for the planning period.

<b>Table 45 Progress Toward the Regional Housing Need, Unincorporated Mono County, 2007-2009</b>			
<b>Income Group</b>	<b>Regional Housing Need</b>	<b>Units Constructed</b>	<b>Remaining Housing Need</b>
Extremely Low	29 units	0	29
Very Low	30 units	1	29
Low	59 units	12	47
Moderate	58 units	13	45
Above Moderate	116 units	42	74
<b>Total</b>	<b>292 units</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>224</b>
<i>Sources: Mono County Community Development Dept, HCD – Regional Housing Need Plan.</i>			

## QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

Table 46 presents Mono County's quantified housing objectives for the planning period. In contrast to the prior planning period for the housing element, housing starts have slowed dramatically in the County. During the prior planning period, the County experienced explosive growth in new residential construction, meeting much of the County's identified regional housing need by new construction. Over the past two years, housing starts have dropped from 27 units in 2007, to 13 units in 2008, to 4 units in the first half of 2009. The County has approved several large subdivisions during this period that would fulfill part of the regional needs for moderate to above moderate housing. Those subdivisions also have requirements for affordable housing units that would fulfill a portion of the requirement for very low and low housing.

The rehabilitation objectives reflect the anticipated rehabilitation of a number of low-income Indian Authority housing units in the Antelope Valley as well as rehabilitation efforts in community areas. The conservation and preservation objectives reflect ongoing conservation efforts such as weatherization programs.

**Table 46 Quantified Objectives**

<b>Income Group</b>	<b>New Construction</b>	<b>Rehabilitation</b>	<b>Conservation and Preservation</b>
Extremely Low (29)	15	14	---
Very Low (29)	6	12	11
Low (47)	10	10	27
Moderate (45)	45	0	0
Above Moderate (74)	74	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>47</b>
<i>Source: Mono County Community Development Department.</i>			

# III. RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

---

## A. LAND INVENTORY

### PHYSICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

There are areas within Mono County that are unavailable for residential development because of site constraints such as natural hazards or environmentally sensitive lands. The high cost of building on these lands, coupled with environmental constraints, in many cases would make them unsuitable for development.

Development in the following areas may be prohibited by the County's General Plan and/or Land Development Regulations or by requirements of other state or federal agencies, may present a hazard to those who choose to build in the area, or may impact valuable resources and require costly mitigation measures:

- a. ***Remote Locations.*** Some privately owned undeveloped land in Mono County is located in very remote areas where there is not, nor is there expected to be, demand for development. Reasonable legal access to these lands cannot be developed or acquired, and most of the time the County would not be able to provide the normal, expected, public services of police and fire protection, schools, etc. Most of the land in remote areas is not designated for residential use because of its remoteness. It is generally designated Agriculture and is used either for grazing or crops (in Oasis). Many of these lands are pockets of privately owned land surrounded by public lands managed by the U.S. Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management. In addition, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, technically a private landowner, owns land throughout the central and southern portion of the County. Most of the land in remote locations would not be developable for other reasons as well, such as hazards associated with the area or environmentally sensitive lands in those areas. The remote location of some private land is generally not a constraint to development since most of the private land base is centered around existing community areas.
  
- b. ***Hazard-Prone Areas.*** Mono County currently regulates development in snow avalanche-prone areas as well as in areas identified as Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones (fault hazard zones), in other geologically sensitive areas, and in flood plains. Mono County General Plan policies (Safety Element) limit development in identified hazardous areas in order to minimize the risks of those hazards and to protect local communities from unreasonable risks associated with those hazards. General Plan policies also promote land exchanges for those lands to place them in public ownership and make other lands adjacent to community areas available for future community expansion.

Snow avalanche-prone areas are located in Twin Lakes, June Lake and Wheeler Crest, along the edges of those communities. Sufficient other sites are available

for development in those communities so that the avalanche-prone areas do not affect development potential significantly.

Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones (fault hazard zones) occur throughout the County, many of them outside community areas. General Plan policies limit the intensity of development in seismic and other geologic hazard areas and require applicable development in those areas to provide a geotechnical report assessing the risk and recommending mitigation measures to reduce the risk to acceptable levels. The Building Division also requires new construction to comply with engineering and design requirements for seismic safety. The impact of fault hazard zones on new development is not significant. Other geologic hazards, such as rockfalls and landslides, are generally associated with seismic activity and are subject to the same development requirements noted above.

Mono County uses the FEMA flood maps to identify areas within the 100-year flood plain. General Plan policies limit the intensity of development in the flood plain and regulate the placement of structures in the 100-year flood plain. The County's Floodplain Regulations (Mono County Land Development Regulations, Chapter 21) contain standards for construction and for subdivisions with the flood plain. Flooding is a particular concern in the Antelope Valley and the Tri-Valley. There is enough land in community areas that avoidance of flood plains does not significantly affect the County's ability to provide housing.

- c. ***Soils with Low Permeability Rates.*** Many parts of the County are not served by public sewer systems and must rely on septic systems. In some parts of the County, standard septic systems cannot be used because the soils have low permeability rates that prevent effective operation of septic tank systems. This is a very limited issue that affects only a small number of parcels. Alternative septic system designs are available and, while they may be more costly, they do allow the site to be developed.
  
- d. ***Environmentally Sensitive Areas.*** Development is regulated in wetland areas, within stream corridors, in sensitive wildlife habitat, and in other environmentally sensitive areas. Environmentally sensitive areas occur throughout the County. Typically, parcels are large enough that the environmentally sensitive area can be avoided and the parcel can still be utilized for development. Parcels with environmentally sensitive areas usually require CEQA review of any proposed projects; during the CEQA review process, the project will be redesigned to avoid environmental impacts, and mitigation measures will be proposed to minimize impacts that cannot be avoided. Mono County General Plan policies encourage clustering on large parcels outside community areas in order to preserve habitat and avoid and/or minimize environmental impacts.

## ZONING FOR LOWER-INCOME HOUSING

Mono County has several land use designations that specifically provide density bonuses for affordable housing and that are intended to provide for the efficient use of land and to increase opportunities for affordable housing. The following land use designations promote the provision of affordable housing:

### **Multiple-Family Residential – Low, Moderate, and High (MFR-L, M, H)**

The MFR-L designation is intended to provide for low-density multifamily residential development such as duplexes and triplexes. The MFR-M designation is intended to encourage long-term multifamily housing by allowing for higher population densities and by not allowing commercial lodging facilities; i.e., hotels, motels. The MFR-H designation is intended to encourage multifamily units by allowing for higher population densities and to provide for commercial lodging facilities; i.e., hotels, motels.

All of the designations allow duplexes and triplexes. All of the designations allow condominiums, cooperatives, townhomes, cluster developments, and apartments containing four or more units subject to Use Permit. The MFR-H designation also allows mobile-home parks subject to Use Permit.

Density bonuses are available in the MFR-M and MFR-H designations for affordable housing. The MFR-M also provides a bonus for enclosed, covered parking. In no case shall projects containing affordable housing and/or enclosed, covered parking density bonuses exceed 26 units/acre.

1. Density bonuses are available to residential projects at a rate of 35% over the maximum density or a ratio of one bonus unit to one affordable/employee housing unit, whichever is greater. Density bonuses will be awarded in a manner consistent with Government Code Section 65915.
2. Units designated as manager/employee housing unit shall not be counted in density calculations.
3. Density bonuses for enclosed, covered parking are available at a rate of one bonus dwelling unit per two enclosed, covered parking spaces. Projects must provide enclosed, covered parking for at least 50% of the units to qualify for bonuses. Density bonuses would be calculated on the surplus of required covered parking spaces greater than 50%.

### **Mixed Use (MU)**

The MU designation is intended to provide for a wide range of compatible resident- and visitor- oriented residential and commercial uses, including business, professional, and retail uses; to provide for efficient use of land and increased opportunities for affordable housing; to provide a transition between intensive commercial uses and residential uses; and to be applied to areas with existing mixed use development. MU transitional areas can limit the size of business establishments and restrict uses incompatible with residential districts. Not all areas need contain

**residential uses. Commercial uses shall conform to strict standards that prohibit obnoxious odors, obtrusive light and glare, and excessive noise.**

The MU designation allows duplexes and triplexes. Condominiums, townhomes, and apartments are allowed subject to Director Review permit. Mobile-home parks are allowed subject to Use Permit.

An additional lot coverage bonus of 10 percent (total coverage of 70 percent) shall be granted to structures that contain mixed commercial and residential (employee or long-term rentals) uses; commercial uses with public accommodations; or commercial uses that front a public pedestrian mall or plaza.

Density bonuses are available for affordable housing and enclosed, covered parking. In no case shall projects containing affordable housing and/or parking density bonuses exceed 26 units per acre for residential units and 60 units per acre for commercial lodging units.

1. Density bonuses are available to residential and commercial lodging projects at a rate of 35% over the maximum density or a ratio of one bonus unit to one affordable/employee housing unit, whichever is greater. Density bonuses will be awarded in a manner consistent with Government Code Section 65915.
2. Units designated as manager/employee housing unit shall not be counted in density calculations.
3. Density bonuses for enclosed, covered parking are available at a rate of one bonus dwelling unit per two covered parking spaces. Projects must provide enclosed, covered parking for at least 50% of the units to qualify for bonuses. Density bonuses would be calculated on the surplus of required covered parking spaces greater than 50%.

**Commercial Lodging – Moderate, High (CL-M, H)**

**The CL-M designation is intended to provide commercial lodging units for short-term occupation in or near residential uses. The CL-H designation is intended to provide short-term commercial lodging units in close proximity to commercial/recreational centers.**

Duplexes and triplexes are allowed in both designations. Mobile-home parks, condominiums, cooperatives, townhomes, cluster developments, and apartments containing four or more units are allowed in both designations subject to Use Permit.

Density bonuses are available for affordable housing and enclosed, covered parking. In no case shall projects containing affordable housing and/or parking density bonuses exceed 26 units/acre for residential units and 60 units per acre for commercial lodging units in the CL-H.

1. Density bonuses are available to residential and commercial lodging projects at a rate of 35% over the maximum density or a ratio of one bonus unit to one



- affordable/employee housing unit, whichever is greater. Density bonuses will be awarded in a manner consistent with Government Code Section 65915.
2. Units designated as manager/employee housing unit shall not be counted in density calculations.
  3. Density bonuses for enclosed, covered parking are available at a rate of one bonus dwelling unit per two enclosed, covered parking spaces. Projects must provide enclosed, covered parking for at least 50% of the units to qualify for bonuses. Density bonuses would be calculated on the surplus of required covered parking spaces greater than 50%.

In addition to the above, the Mono County Housing Mitigation Requirements (Mono County Code, Chapter 15.40) provide for density bonus incentives pursuant to the California Density Bonus Law for any project that meets the criteria set forth in Government Code Section 65915. The Housing Mitigation Requirements also allow the county to consider an additional density bonus upon request of the developer when such request can be accommodated within the parameters of the Mono County general plan or any applicable specific plan.

Mono County also has several land use designations that allow for the use of a mobile home as a single-family residence, provided that the mobile home is newer than 10 years old and meets other specified requirements. The following land use designations allow mobile homes to be used as single-family residences:

- Estate Residential (ER) – minimum parcel size 1 acre
- Rural Residential (RR) – minimum parcel size 1 acre
- Rural Mobile Home (RMH) – minimum parcel size 1 acre
- Single-family Residential (SFR) – minimum parcel size 7,500 square feet

Lands designated SFR are generally in community areas. Lands designated ER, RR, and RMH are generally in more rural areas, outside community areas, where land may be less expensive.

## **AVAILABILITY OF INFRASTRUCTURE TO IDENTIFIED LANDS**

Much of the land available for residential development in the unincorporated area requires individual septic systems and wells. Some areas of the County have small community water systems but still require individual septic systems; other areas have community sewer systems but require individual wells.

- Antelope Valley Individual wells and septic systems required.
- Bridgeport Valley Community water within community of Bridgeport and Evans Tract with adequate capacity. Community sewer system within Bridgeport with adequate capacity. Individual systems required elsewhere.
- Mono City Mutual water company supplies water; individual septic systems required.



Virginia Lakes	Mutual water company supplies water; individual septic systems required.
Lee Vining	Community water and sewer system with adequate capacity. Individual systems required in the rest of Mono Basin.
June Lake	Community water and sewer system, currently with adequate capacity. Large developments may be required to make improvements to the water distribution system that is currently inadequate in some areas of the community.
Long Valley	Community sewer system in Crowley; septic systems elsewhere. Mutual water companies in Crowley and Sunny Slopes; individual wells elsewhere. Some of these water companies have determined that their water supply is insufficient to provide adequate water to their service area and have passed resolutions opposing any new secondary units in the area or lot splits that would increase the potential number of dwelling units in the area.
Wheeler Crest	Mutual water company at Rimrock; individual wells elsewhere. Individual septic system required.
Paradise	Mutual water company at Paradise. Individual septic systems required.
Tri-Valley	Mutual water companies in White Mountain Estates, Osage Ranch; individual wells elsewhere. Individual septic systems required.
Outside community areas	Individuals wells and septic systems required. Community systems may be required for large developments (subdivisions, specific plan developments).

Water quality requirements affect both community water and sewer systems and individual homeowners. Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) water quality regulations affect the minimum lot size on which development can occur depending on whether community water and/or sewer systems are available; i.e.,

- Community water and sewer available – no minimum lot size established by RWQCB;
- Community water available, individual septic required – 20,000 square foot minimum lot size required by RWQCB;
- No community systems available, individual wells and septic required – 40,000 square foot minimum lot size required by RWQCB; and
- Minimum lot sizes in cluster subdivisions or similar developments not served by a public sewer system may be reduced if density standards for the whole subdivision are not increased above the gross density specified in the designation, provided that all other health requirements are met.

In some areas in the County where individual lots are 7,500 square feet, these requirements make it necessary to have more than one lot to build a house. Some areas of the County also have soils that are not conducive to standard septic system designs. Those

areas may require additional septic system improvements that increase the cost of building.

The lack of improved roads throughout the County also affects the potential for development. The main thoroughfares in the County are U.S. 395, U.S. 6 and State Routes 120, 158, 167, 108, and 89. Each of the community areas has a road system; some of these roads are improved, some are not. Some roads in community areas are included in the County road system; some are not. Those that are not are often unimproved. Outside community areas, numerous single-lane and two-lane dirt and gravel roads exist as a result of mining and logging activity. Many of these roads are used by off-road vehicles.

Economic concerns focus on the need for development projects to "pay their own way" and on the need to provide for local economic growth. Most of the services and infrastructure in the County are provided either by the County or local special districts. All of these agencies have been hard hit by lower property tax revenues and increasing service demands. The County must ensure that development does not adversely impact service agencies.

## **REDEVELOPABLE SITES**

Mono County has sufficient undeveloped sites available to meet its identified regional housing needs. There is no need to include redevelopable sites as part of this analysis.

## **SITES & ZONING THAT FACILITATE HOUSING FOR FARMWORKERS & HOMELESS**

The Agriculture (AG) designation allows farm labor housing without any type of development permit, other than a building permit. The Scenic Area Agriculture (SAA) designation also allows farm labor housing without any type of development permit, other than a building permit, to the extent the development complies with the **Mono Basin National Forest Scenic Area Private Property Development Guidelines** and with the **Compatibility Determinations for Proposed New Commercial Uses and Developments**. Compatibility determinations are based upon recommendations of the U.S. Forest Service.

The SAA designation applies to only four acres within the Mono Basin National Forest Scenic Area. The AG designation applies to 79,156 acres throughout the County, primarily in Antelope Valley, Bridgeport Valley, and Tri-Valley. The minimum parcel size for the AG designation is set at 2.5 acres but actually varies by area. Minimum parcel sizes and densities are established by land use designation maps and policies for the Antelope Valley, Bridgeport Valley, and Tri-Valley. There is a ten-acre minimum in Antelope Valley. Bridgeport Valley and Tri-Valley utilize a transfer of development rights program that allows for more concentrated development in small areas while maintaining large areas in agricultural uses.

There are no specific development standards for farmworker housing; it is subject to the same development standards as other housing. Farmworker housing is not a significant issue in Mono County. There is sufficient appropriately zoned land to provide additional farmworker housing; there is nothing in the Mono County Land Development Regulations that impedes the development of farmworker housing.

## **SITES INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS**

The County's share of the regional housing need for the planning period is a total of 292 housing units, allocated to specific income groups as follows:

Extremely Low Income Units	=	29 units
Very Low Income Units	=	30 units
Low Income Units	=	59 units
Moderate Income Units	=	58 units
Above Moderate Income Units	=	116 units

Government Code Sections 65583 and 65583.2 require a parcel-specific inventory of appropriately zoned, available, and suitable sites that can provide realistic opportunities for the provision of housing to all income segments within the community.

Although the County's regional housing need is in the process of being met through a variety of ongoing development (units built since the beginning of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation period, second units, available and appropriately zoned land), to ensure that there are adequate sites in the unincorporated area of the county to meet the identified housing needs, the sites inventory identifies vacant sites that are appropriately zoned for various types of residential development, that have the available infrastructure, and that are without site constraints.

### **Land Use Inventory**

Table 47, Land Use Inventory, analyzes the capacity of available land by planning/community areas and land use designations. The table notes the range of densities allowed in each land use designation, the number of parcels in each land use designation in each planning area, the typical built density in each land use designation in each planning area, whether services are available (community sewer and water), and estimates a realistic capacity for each land use designation in each planning area.

The realistic capacity is based on the typically built densities in each land use designation multiplied by the acreage available in that designation. Maximum allowable densities are not achievable in many areas of the County based on environmental constraints, lack of infrastructure, lack of access, and/or community desire to keep large parcels of agricultural land as open space. The typically built densities reflect these constraints. Maximum allowable densities are achieved much more often in community areas that have available infrastructure and no environmental constraints to development. Land outside of community areas is the land that often lacks infrastructure and access, has

environmental constraints to development, and is often slated to remain in large parcels for a variety of environmental and aesthetic reasons.

Mono County has sufficient realistic capacity in all land use designations and all community areas to meet its identified regional housing needs. In June Lake alone, where there is a particular need for higher-density housing for lower-income households, there are a sufficient number of parcels of adequate size to meet the identified regional housing needs. Table 47 B shows the number of vacant parcels in the multifamily housing designations in June Lake and the size of those parcels.

### **Parcel Specific Inventory: Very Low- and Low-Income Housing**

An Available Parcel Inventory is included in Appendix B. The County's GIS system was used to identify parcels for this inventory and data related to those parcels. The County's Land Use Designations and Land Use Regulations were then utilized, along with staff knowledge of the sites, to develop a realistic unit capacity for the sites. Mono County does not have separate zoning; the Land Use Designations and Land Development Regulations in the Mono County General Plan contain the extensive site development standards and land use controls that in other communities might be included in a zoning code.

Mono County's allocated regional housing need for very low- and low-income housing is 118 units; this includes housing for extremely low-income households. The inventory for very low- and low-income housing focuses on the potential for multi-family residential development in Bridgeport, Lee Vining, and June Lake. These communities are walkable, have transportation links to the remainder of the County, are relatively close to Mammoth where many low income residents work, have higher numbers of low income service workers within the communities, have sewer and water infrastructure, and have a variety of other goods and services available within the community. Other communities in the county do not meet these criteria. All of these communities have large areas of undeveloped land that is designated for multi-family residential development, which is usually more affordable for lower income groups.

The Available Parcel Inventory shows a capacity of 438 units for multi-family housing, more than enough to meet the allocated need of 118 units. In addition to the parcels identified in the Available Parcel Inventory, Mono County has recently approved 3 subdivisions that include requirements for affordable housing units, i.e.:

Mt. Vistas (Chalfant)	APN 26-210-37, 28.95 acres, 39 sfr, including 2 AH units
White Mt. Estates (Chalfant)	APNs 26-240-09 and 10, 70.38 acres, 46 sfr, including 2 AH units
Rock Creek Ranch (Paradise)	APN 26-330-02 53.3 acres, 60 sfr, including 5 AH and 11 secondary units

The parcels in the Very Low- and Low-Income section of the Parcel Inventory are only a sample of the sites available for development and are being used for illustrative purposes only, to show that the County has sufficient vacant land to meet its identified need for

very low- and low-income housing. Inclusion of these specific parcels in the inventory is in no way an indication that those sites should or will be developed for affordable housing. Appendix B contains additional information on all parcels in the unincorporated portion of the county that show an improvement value of less than \$10,000 and are therefore basically unimproved and available for development. The county currently has over 450 parcels that meet that criteria.

### **Parcel Specific Inventory: Moderate- and Above Moderate-Income Housing**

Mono County's allocated regional housing need for moderate- and above moderate-income housing is 174 units. As noted above, Mono County has recently approved 3 subdivisions that will provide appropriately designated, available, and suitable sites for the provision of housing for those income groups. Mt. Vistas, White Mt. Estates, and Rock Creek Ranch will provide 136 units of moderate- and above moderate-income housing. The County has sufficient vacant land designated for single-family residential development (as shown in Table 47) to provide the remaining 38 units of moderate- and above moderate-income housing. Land designated for single-family residential development often requires individual sewer and water systems.

### **Determination of Realistic Capacity**

#### ***Methodology***

The inventory for very low- and low-income housing focuses on the potential for multi-family residential development in Bridgeport, Lee Vining, and June Lake. These parcels are designated Multi-Family Residential, low, medium or high (MFR-L, M, or H) or Commercial (C). As discussed in Appendix B, parcels in the multi-family residential designations are anticipated to develop to their maximum allowable density. Those sites have adequate infrastructure and access to allow for full development of the sites, and no environmental constraints to development. The County's land use controls and site development standards do not constrain development on those parcels; the Land Development Regulations provide for increased development on those sites. The multi-family designations provide for higher lot coverage than other residential designation (60 % vs. 40 %), allowing for higher-density housing. Density bonuses are available in MFR designations for projects that provide affordable housing and/or enclosed, covered parking.

As discussed in Appendix B, parcels in the Commercial designation are anticipated to develop with 50 percent residential uses and 50 percent non-residential uses. Those sites have adequate infrastructure and access to allow for full development of the sites, and no environmental constraints to development. The County's land use controls and site development standards do not constrain development on those parcels; the Land Development Regulations provide for increased development on those sites. The commercial designation provides for higher lot coverage than other residential designation (60 % vs. 40 %), allowing for higher-density housing. Other standards also promote higher-density housing in the commercial designation; e.g., the C designation has a zero side yard setback unless the site abuts a residential district.

Commercial development in the unincorporated communities in Mono County is small scale, and is typically oriented towards meeting the lodging, dining, minor shopping needs, and recreational needs of residents and visitors. Most communities in the unincorporated area are not large enough to support extensive commercial development; most residents utilize shopping and services in surrounding larger developments (Bishop, Mammoth Lakes, Gardnerville, NV). It is anticipated that this trend will continue and that land designated for commercial uses will not be fully developed with commercial uses, particularly since there is a greater need at this point for low cost housing.

Mono County has not had any multi-family residential development either approved or constructed in recent years. Recently approved large-scale single-family residential development has included requirements for the inclusion of affordable housing units within the development. Large lot sizes have enabled this development to be clustered to avoid environmental constraints on-site while still achieving maximum density for the site. Development in the recently approved Rock Creek Ranch in Paradise will be clustered but will be the maximum allowable density for the site, including secondary units.

### ***Mobilehomes and Manufactured Housing***

Mobilehomes and manufactured housing have historically been used in Mono County to make housing affordable, often in areas where individual wells and septic systems are required. Many of the county's communities have mobilehome parks and a large percentage of the dwelling units in some communities are either mobilehomes or manufactured housing. Both housing types are allowed in all single-family residential designations. In addition, the County's Land Development Regulations allow mobilehome parks and manufactured housing subdivisions in a variety of residential designations. The Land Development Regulations contain development standards for both mobilehome parks (Chapter 17) and manufactured housing subdivisions (Chapter 18).

Mobilehomes and manufactured continue to be used to increase the affordability of housing. Recently approved large-scale subdivisions allow for the installation of manufactured housing on all or a large percentage of the lots in order to lower the cost of that housing and make it affordable for the county's residents.

### ***Small Sites***

Development in the unincorporated areas of Mono County occurs at a much smaller scale than elsewhere. Over the last 15 years, the average number of all residential units constructed annually has been 40. The only largescale multi-family development in the unincorporated area is the Marine Corps housing at Coleville. As the county's largest community, the Town of Mammoth Lakes has much more multi-family housing, of various types and sizes. The demand for multi-family housing and affordable workforce housing is also highest in Mammoth since much of the county's employment is located there, particularly lower-paying seasonal and service jobs. Mammoth Housing Inc. has built a variety of workforce housing in Mammoth in recent years but the scale of those

projects has been smaller than found elsewhere; two 24-unit condo projects, two 16-unit apartment projects, and a 48-unit apartment project. It is anticipated that affordable housing in Mono County will occur at a much smaller scale than elsewhere and will be more geographically dispersed, given the dispersed nature of the county's population and development. The small sites identified in the parcel inventory are therefore considered to be suitable for affordable housing development. As is shown by the land inventory in Table 48, the county has ample vacant land that is appropriately designated and without development constraints to meet its identified regional housing needs. The parcels in the Parcel Inventory were identified as potential parcels to meet the ELI, very-low, and low income housing needs because those parcels are located in communities that are walkable, have transportation links to the remainder of the County, are relatively close to Mammoth where many low income residents work, have higher numbers of low income service workers within the communities, have sewer and water infrastructure, and have a variety of other goods and services available within the community. However, those parcels are not the only parcels in the county available to meet those very-low and low-income needs.



**Table 47A Land Use Inventory**

<b>Antelope Valley</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
AG	1 du/10 ac	94	9122	1 du/80 acres	None Available	114 du
C	15 du/acre	1	4	2 du/acre	None Available	8 du
ER	1 du/acre	114	329	1 du/ 2 acre	None Available	164 du
MU	15 du/acre	38	96	1.5 du/ acre	None Available	144 du
OS	1 du/80 ac	17	1180	1 du 80 acres	None Available	15 du
RM	1 du/40 ac	93	540	1 du/ 40 ac	None Available	14 du
RMH	1 du/2.5 ac	9	24	1 du/2.5 ac	None Available	10 du
RR	1 du/ acre	45	784	1 du/ 3 acres	None Available	261 du
RU	1 du/5 ac	3	4	2 du/ acre	None Available	8 du
SP/ER	-----	5	160	1 du/acre	None Available	160 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>12243</b>			<b>898 du</b>

<b>Swauger Creek</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
ER	1 du/40 ac	2	76	1 du/ 40 ac	None available	2 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>76</b>			<b>2 du</b>



**Table 47A Land Use Inventory -- continued**

<b>Bridgeport</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
ER	1 du/ acre	33	215	1 du/ acres	None Available	215 du
RR	1 du/ acre	22	23	1 du/ acres	None Available	23 du
SFR	5.8 du/ acre	132	155	2 du/acres	Water Only	310 du
MFR-L	11.6 du/ ac	11	15	8 du/ acres	Water and Sewer	120 du
MFR-M	15 du/ acre	7	2	13 du/acres	Water and Sewer	26 du
MU	15 du/ acre	16	27	2 du/ acre	Water Only	54 du
RU	1 du/ 5 acre	3	6	2 du/ acre	Water Only	12 du
C	15 du/ acre	8	6	15 du/acres	Water and Sewer	90 du
SC	15 du/ acre	1	2	2 du/ acre	Water Only	4 du
RM	1 du/40 acre	100	654	1 du/ 40 ac	None Available	16 du
AG	1 du/ 2.5 ac	49	22,220	1 du/ 20 ac	None Available	1111 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>23325</b>			<b>1981 du</b>

<b>Bodie Hills</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
RU	1 du/ 5 acres	1	106	2 du/ acre	None Available	53 du
AG	1 du/ 2.5 acres	104	7431	1 du/ 20 acres	None Available	371 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>7537</b>			<b>424 du</b>

**Table 47A Land Use Inventory -- continued**

<b>Mono Basin North</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
ER	1 du/ acre	13	139	1 du/acres	None Available	139 du
RR	1 du/ acre	4	161	1 du/ acres	None Available	161 du
SFR	5.8 du/acre	94	20	2 du/ acres	Water only	40 du
SFR	1 du/ 10 ac	6	64	1 du/10 acres	None Available	6 du
RM	1 du/ 40 ac	81	4,405	1 du/ 40 ac	None Available	110 du
AG	1 du/ 2.5 ac	2	180	1 du/ 20 ac	None Available	9 du
SP	–	112	876	1 du/ acres	None Available	876 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>5845</b>			<b>1341 du</b>

<b>Mono Basin South</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
SFR	5.8 du/ acre	3	2	4 du/ acre	Water and Sewer	8 du
C	15 du/ acre	52	18	12 du/ acre	Water and Sewer	216 du
OS	1 du/ 40 ac	15	3035	1 du/ 40 ac	Water and Sewer	76 du
SP	–	1	69	7 du/ acres	Water and Sewer	483 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>3124</b>			<b>783 du</b>

**Table 47A Land Use Inventory -- continued**

<b>June Lake</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
ER	1 du/ acres	2	3	1 du/ acre	Water and Sewer	3 du
SFR	5.8 du/acres	158	95	4 du/ acre	Water and Sewer	380 du
MFR-L	11.6 du/acre	17	4	9 du/ acre	Water and Sewer	36 du
MFR-H	15 du/ acres	8	2	11 du/acres	Water and Sewer	22 du
MU	15 du/ acres	19	3	11 du/acres	Water and Sewer	57 du
CL, M	15 du/ acres	14	5	12 du/acres	Water and Sewer	60 du
CL,H	15 du/ acres	21	7	13 du/acres	Water and Sewer	91 du
RU	1du/ 5 acres	2	147	1 du/ 5 acres	Water and Sewer	30 du
C	15 du/ acres	19	4	12 du/acres	Water and Sewer	48 du
NHP	1 du/5 acres	4	29	1 du/ 5 acres	Water and Sewer	6 du
SP	–	7	98	11 du/ acre	Water and Sewer	1078 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>397</b>			<b>1811 du</b>

<b>Mammoth Vicinity</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
RM	1 du/ 40 ac	4	510	1 du/ 40 ac	None Available	13 du
AG	1 du/ 80 ac	5	350	1 du/ 80 ac	None Available	44 du
AG	1 du/ 2.5ac	10	2480	1 du/ 20 ac	None Available	124 du
OS	1 du/ 40 ac	77	14136	1 du/ 40 ac	None Available	353 du
SP	–	1	141	8 du/ acres	None Available	1128 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>17617</b>			<b>1662 du</b>

**Table 47A Land Use Inventory -- continued**

<b>Wheeler Crest</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
ER	1 du/ acre	22	368	2 du/ acre	None Available	184 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>368</b>			<b>184 du</b>

<b>Chalfant</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
ER	1 du/acre	35	57	1 du/ acre	None Available	57 du
RMH	1du/ acre	32	110	1 du/ acre	None Available	110 du
RM	1 du/ 40 ac	67	102	1 du/ 40 acre	None Available	3 du
AG	1 du/ 2.5 ac	7	821	1 du/ 40 acre	None Available	21 du
OS		15	4767	1 du/ 40 acre	None Available	119 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>5857</b>			<b>310 du</b>

<b>Hammil</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
RR	1 du/ 10 ac	7	137	1 du/ 10 ac	None Available	14 du
RM	1 du/ 40 ac	5	300	1 du/ 40 ac	None Available	8 du
AG	1 du/ 10 ac	20	1406	1 du/ 10 ac	None Available	141 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>1843</b>			<b>163 du</b>

**Table 47A Land Use Inventory -- continued**

<b>Benton</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
RR	1 du/ acre	20	1030	1 du/ acres	None Available	1030 du
MU	15 du/acre	1	129	2 du/ acres	None Available	258 du
RU	1 du/ 5 acres	1	30	2 du/ acres	None Available	60 du
C	15 du/acre	2	7	2 du/ acres	None Available	14 du
RM	1 du/ 40 ac	105	760	1 du/ 40 ac	None Available	19 du
AG	1 du/ 2.5	12	933	1 du/ 5 acres	None Available	187 du
<b>Totals</b>			2889			1568 du

<b>Oasis</b>						
<b>LUD</b>	<b>Density Range</b>	<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
AG	1 du/ 2.5 ac	6	344	1 du/ 5 acres	None Available	69 du
<b>Totals</b>			344			69 du

<b>Outside Planning Areas</b>						
<b>LUD</b>		<b># Parcels</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Typical Density</b>	<b>Services Availability</b>	<b>Estimated Realistic Capacity</b>
ER	1 du/ acre		684	1 du/ acres	None Available	684 du
SFR	5.8 du/ acre		75	1 du/ acres	None Available	75 du
RU	1 du/ 5 acre		45	1 du/ 7 acres	None Available	7 du
RM	1 du/ 40 ac		11334	1 du/ 40 acre	None Available	283 du
AG	1 du/ 2.5 ac		7752	1 du/ 15 acre	None Available	517 du
<b>Totals</b>			<b>19890</b>			<b>1566 du</b>

**Table 47B Vacant Parcel Size, June Lake**

<b>Multi-Family Residential, Low</b>	14 parcels between 0.17 and 0.19 acres 3 parcels between 0.2 and 0.25 acres 3.17 acres total
<b>Multi-Family Residential, High</b>	4 parcels under 0.1 acres 1 parcel between 0.1 and 0.2 acres 1 parcel between 0.2 and 0.3 acres 2 parcels between 0.4 and 0.5 acres 1.4412 acres total
<b>Commercial Lodging, Moderate</b>	1 parcel under 0.1 acres 4 parcels between 0.1 and 0.2 acres 6 parcels between 0.2 and 0.3 acres 1 parcel between 0.6 and 0.7 acres 2 parcels between 1.0 and 1.2 acres 4.872 acres total
<b>Commercial Lodging, High</b>	6 parcels under 0.1 acres 8 parcels between 0.1 and 0.2 acres 1 parcel between 0.2 and 0.3 acres 1 parcel between 0.3 and 0.4 acres 2 parcels between 0.5 and 0.6 acres 1 parcel between 0.6 and 0.7 acres 1 parcel between 1.2 and 1.3 acres 1 parcel between 2.0 and 2.1 acres 6.978 acres total
<b>Commercial</b>	5 parcels under 0.1 acres 11 parcels between 0.1 and 0.2 acres 3 parcels between 0.3 and 0.4 acres 2.622 acres total
<b>Mixed Use</b>	12 parcels between 0.1 and 0.2 acres 5 parcels between 0.2 and 0.3 acres 2 parcels between 0.3 and 0.4 acres <b>3.33 acres total</b>

## **B. GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS**

### **LAND USE CONTROLS**

Mono County's Land Use Designations and Land Development Regulations, which are integrated into the Mono County Land Use Element, provide for residential development throughout the unincorporated portion of the County (Table 48). The Land Use Designations contain development standards for each of the land use designations; general standards that pertain to all development are contained in the Land Development Regulations. The county does not have separate zoning regulations.

Mono County's land use designations permit single-family residential development, including mobile homes, in almost all designations within developed community areas and in rural areas. Multifamily residential development is permitted in multifamily, mixed use, commercial, and commercial lodging area designations, primarily in developed community areas. The County's Land Use Element, including the Land Development Regulations, does not contain any growth-control measures.

Secondary housing units are permitted in several land use designations subject to ministerial review and meeting development requirements in the Land Development Regulations. Mobile homes have been identified as an affordable housing type in Mono County and are permitted as single-family residences in many land use designations throughout the County (Table 48). Mobile-home parks are permitted in a number of designations, subject to a Use Permit and meeting state requirements for mobile-home parks.

Development of agricultural lands is determined by policies in the Mono County Land Use Element intended to preserve agricultural uses, to protect agricultural uses from the encroachment of incompatible land uses, while allowing for the continuation of agricultural production and the development of limited housing. The minimum parcel size for agricultural land is 2.5 acres but actually varies by area. Minimum parcel sizes and densities are established on the County's land use maps. The minimum parcel size for agricultural lands in the Antelope Valley is 10 acres. Development of agricultural lands in the Bridgeport Valley, the Bodie Hills, and the Hammil Valley is subject to a Transfer of Development Rights program established for each of those areas. Potential development is clustered to preserve agricultural uses. Larger parcel sizes and lower densities on agricultural lands have not been identified as a constraint to development in Mono County because there is sufficient land elsewhere to meet identified needs.

Residential development standards for residential land use designations are illustrated in Table 48 A. Reductions in several standards are allowed in certain situations; e.g., density bonuses are available in multifamily, mixed use, and commercial lodging designations for projects that provide affordable housing and/or enclosed, covered parking (from 15 dwelling units per acre to 26 units per acre). Lot coverage in the mixed use designation may be increased from 60 percent to 70 percent if the development includes residential

**Table 48 A Housing Types Permitted by Land Use Designation**

Housing Types Permitted	RR	ER	RMH	SFR	MFR-L	MFR-M	MFR-H	MU	CL-M	CL-H	RU	C	SC	PF	RM	AG	SAA	OS	NHP	RE
Single-family dwelling	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P***	P***		P	P	P	P	P	
Mobile home	P	P	P	P	P	---	---	P*			P				P	P	P			
Secondary unit	DR	DR	DR	DR	---	---	---				DR				DR	DR	DR****			
Mobile-home park	UP	UP	UP	UP	---	---	UP	UP	UP	UP										
Duplexes and triplexes					P	P	P	P	P	P		P***	P***							
Condominiums, townhomes, apartments with 4+ units					UP	UP	UP	DR	UP	UP		UP***	UP***						UP*****	
Social care facilities							UP	DR												
Transient rentals (less than 30 consecutive days) of 4+ units							UP		UP**	UP**	UP								DR**	
Conversion of 5 or more apartment units into transient rentals									UP	UP										
Group homes, juvenile facilities, schools and similar facilities														UP						
Farm labor housing																P	P			
Farm labor trailer parks																UP				
Employee housing											UP									P

Notes: P = Permitted Use, D = Permitted Subject to Director Review permit, UP = Permitted Subject to Conditional Use Permit.

\* except in June Lake.

\*\*transient rentals up to 3 days permitted with Director Review permit.

\*\*\*when found compatible with the intent of the commercial designation.

\*\*\*\*attached secondary units.

\*\*\*\*\*limited density when found compatible with the area by the planning commission.

Source: Mono County General Plan, Land Use Element, Land Use Designations

**02.1070 Social care facility.** "Social care facility" means any facility in the general classification of a boarding home for aged persons, boarding home for children, day care home for children, day nursery, nursing home or parent-child boarding home. These facilities consist of a building or group of buildings used or designed for the housing of sick, demented, injured, convalescent, infirm or well, normal healthy persons, requiring licensing or certification by regulating government agencies.

**02.1210 Transient Rental.** "Transient Rental" means any structure, or portion of structure, which is occupied, or intended or designed for occupancy by transients for purposes of sleeping, lodging or similar reasons. A "transient" is any person who exercises occupancy, whether by agreement, concession, permit, right of access, license, contract, payment of rent or otherwise, for a period of thirty (30) consecutive calendar days or less.



**Table 48 B Residential Development Standards by Land Use Designation**

Development Standards	RR	ER	RMH	SFR	MFR-L	MFR-M	MFR-H	MU	CL-M	CL-H	RU	C	SC	AG
Minimum lot area	1 ac	1 ac	1 ac	7,500 sf	sfr/duplex - 7,500 sf mfr - 11,250 sf condos - 2 ac	10,000 sf (<10,000 sf-sfr & duplex) condos - 20,000 sf	7,500 sf condos - 20,000 sf	10,000 sf (<10,000 sf-sfr & duplex) condos - 20,000 sf	10,000 sf (<10,000 sf-sfr, duplex, triplex) condos - 20,000 sf	10,000 sf (<10,000 sf-sfr, duplex, triplex) condos - 20,000 sf	5 ac	10,000 sf	10,000 sf	2.5 ac but varies by area
Minimum district area	5 ac	5 ac	5 ac	5 ac	---	3 ac	5 ac	5 ac	3 ac	5 ac	---	2 ac	3 ac	P
Lot dimensions	Every lot shall have a minimum width and depth of not less than 60 feet by 100 feet unless otherwise specified in land use designation. The lot depth shall not exceed 3 times the lot width, unless the lot is 10 gross acres or larger in size, then a ratio of 4 to 1 is acceptable.													
Lot coverage	40%	40%	40%	40%	40%	60%	60%	60%**	60%	60%	5%	60%	70%	40%
Maximum density	1du/ac	1 du/ac	1 du/ac	5.8 du/ac	11.6 du/ac	15 du/ac*	15 du/ac*	15 du/ac*	15 du/ac*	15 du/ac*	1 du/5 ac	15 du/ac	1 du/lot	Varies by area
Secondary dwelling unit	DR	DR	DR	DR	---	---	---	---	---	---	DR	---	DR	DR
Building height	No greater than 35 feet measured from grade (natural grade or finished grade whichever is more restrictive). Sloping lots on the downhill side of a street - height may increase not to exceed a maximum of 20 feet above centerline of adjacent street. Multifamily projects with entire floor area devoted to underground parking - height of building = vertical distance from ceiling of parking to topmost point of the building. Height of residential development may increase to a maximum of 45 feet if side and rear yards are increased one foot in width for each foot of height over 35 feet.													
Front yard	50'	50'	50'	20'	20'	20'	20'	10'	10'	10'	30'	10'	10'	50'
Rear yard	10 feet in all districts except where Fire Safe Requirements require 30 foot setbacks for parcels one acre or larger (Fire Safe Requirements apply in all the unincorporated area except the Antelope Valley). MU, CL-M, CL-H, C and SC have 5' rear setback.													
Side yards	Above 7000' elevation - 10 feet. Below 7000' elevation - one side yard of 10' and one side yard of 5'. Except where Fire Safe Requirements require 30 foot setbacks for parcels one acre or larger. MU, CL-M, CL-H, C and SC have 0 side setback excepting when abutting residential district, then it is 10'.													
Special yard requirements	Double frontage lots - front yard setbacks on both frontages. Stream setbacks from any stream or lake - a minimum of 30 feet from the top of the bank. Fire Safe Requirements - 30 foot setbacks on all sides for parcels one acre or larger where required.													
Parking	2 spaces per dwelling unit except in June Lake where 3 spaces are required. Multiple family units require 2 spaces for manager's units and guest parking based on the number of units in the project.													
<p>Some of these designations allow uses other than residential uses. This table addresses only residential development standards for each designation.                      UP = Secondary unit allowed with Use Permit. DR= Secondary unit allowed with Use Permit. DU = dwelling unit sf = square feet                      * Density bonuses available in MFR-M, MFR-H, MU, CL-M and CL-H for affordable housing and enclosed, covered parking. Maximum density with bonuses is 26 du/ac.                      **Lot coverage can increase to 70% for structures that contain commercial and residential uses.                      Source: Mono County General Plan, Land Use Element, Land Use Designations and Land Development Regulations.</p>														

and commercial uses. Other standards also promote higher-density housing in commercial, mixed use, and commercial lodging designations; e.g., C, MU, and CL designations have a zero side yard setback unless the site abuts a residential district. The maximum building residential building height may be increased from 35 feet to 45 feet if side and rear setbacks are also increased, allowing larger size housing units to meet the needs of large households.

The County's Housing Mitigation Requirements (Mono County Code, Chapter 15.40) require all residential and non-residential development to contribute to the provision of affordable housing in the county. This contribution may be through constructing affordable units, acquiring affordable units, or paying in-lieu fees. On-site units are required of larger developments. Secondary units may be utilized to meet the inclusionary requirement. The Housing Mitigation Requirements allow for the consideration of alternatives such as land dedication, off-site housing, conversion of existing housing, and payment of in-lieu fees. The ordinance also provides incentives from the county to assist developers in meeting the requirements, e.g. density bonuses, fee waivers or deferral, and reduced site development standards. Several types of projects are exempt from these requirements, including:

1. Multi-family units that will be rented to permanent residents of Mono County or persons employed within Mono County, and that provide at least twenty-five percent of the available units to persons falling within the HUD affordable housing guidelines. To be eligible for this exemption the project must be deed-restricted to prevent the conversion of the multi-family units into condominiums and to ensure that the affordable units remain within the affordable housing guidelines;
2. Residential development for agriculture workers;
3. Mobilehome park development;
4. Any building that is replaced or repaired as a result of fire or other catastrophic damage or loss so long as the square footage is not increased;
5. Any development that is being developed as an affordable housing project as defined by state law.

The County's Housing Mitigation Regulations were developed with extensive public participation and the active engagement of the development community throughout the process.

## **LAND USE REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY OTHER AGENCIES**

A number of other agencies impose land use controls that affect development in Mono County. These regulations may constrain development by affecting the location and/or cost of development.

**Southern California Edison (SCE)** has 115 kv transmission power lines that run through portions of Crowley Lake, June Lake, and Lee Vining. Development is prohibited

within a 70-foot easement under the power lines. SCE works directly with the developer or builder to resolve potential conflicts.

The **Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)** regulates the placement of septic systems. Recent changes in the RWQCB's water quality regulations have set a maximum of two dwelling units per acre in areas that have community water systems but which require individual septic systems. As a result, the minimum lot size in such situations is slightly over 20,000 square feet. The minimum lot size when both individual septic and water systems are required is 40,000 square feet. In some areas in the County where individual lots are 7,500 square feet or smaller, these requirements essentially make it necessary to have more than one lot to build a house. Densities over one dwelling unit per acre are dependent on the availability of community water and sewer services. As a result, the maximum allowable buildout is unlikely to occur on parcels with designations that allow multifamily residential development.

The **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers** regulates development in wetland areas. All development in wetland areas will be reviewed by the Corps and may require a permit. Wetland areas occur throughout the unincorporated area, both within and outside community areas.

The **California Department of Fish and Game (DFG)** reviews development proposals in Mono County, including subdivisions and land divisions, and may require changes to the project or conditions of approval if the project will affect wildlife resources. For projects that will affect streams, the DFG requires a Stream Alteration Permit. The DFG imposes a fee for review of environmental documents (Negative Declarations or EIRs) unless County decision-makers determine that the project will have a de minimis effect on wildlife or wildlife habitat.

## CODES AND ENFORCEMENT

The Mono County Building Division currently enforces the following codes:

- a. 2007 California Administrative Code
- b. 2007 California Building Code
- c. 2007 California Electrical Code
- d. 2007 California Mechanical Code
- e. 2007 California Plumbing Code
- f. 2007 California Energy Code
- g. 2007 California Historical Building Code
- h. 2007 California Fire Code
- i. 2007 California Existing Building Code
- j. 2007 California Referenced Standards Code
- k. 2006 International Property Maintenance Code.
- l. 2006 Uniform Swimming Pool, Spa, & Hot Tub Code.

Development must also comply with seismic, wind, soils, energy conservation, and sound transmission control standards, which have been established on a Countywide basis. Snow-load requirements vary depending on the area; they range from 120 pounds per square foot in June Lake to 40 pounds per square foot in Chalfant Valley. Building Code requirements are generally state standards and do not create a constraint to the development of housing.

The County has an ongoing code compliance program to ensure compliance with the County Code, including the Mono County Land Development Regulations, and the codes enforced by the Building Division. The enforcement of these regulations is necessary to protect the public health and safety and to provide structurally safe, energy efficient, soundproof housing. The Compliance Division program is intended to ensure compliance with existing applicable codes; as such, it does not create a constraint to development. The Building Division inspects development during the construction process. Appointments are scheduled, and inspections occur generally within 48 hours. Since Mono County is a small County, the inspectors are able to communicate with contractors and owner-builders before and during the construction process concerning code requirements. Building inspections are conducted in a timely manner and are not a constraint to development.

## ON-/OFF-SITE IMPROVEMENT STANDARDS

The County requires the following on-site improvements for residential construction:

- New road development is subject to the Mono County Road Standards; i.e.,

<b>Road Type</b>	<b>Minimum Right of Way</b>	<b>Minimum Pavement Width</b>
Residential	60 feet	30 feet**
County Road	60 feet	26 feet
Arterial Commercial	60 feet	40 feet

\*\*The minimum pavement width for residential roads in June Lake is 26 feet due to existing topographical constraints in June Lake.

These road widths are standard road widths and do not impact the cost or supply of housing in the County.

- The County Parking Standards (Mono County Land Development Regulations, Chapter 6) require paved parking areas/spaces and paved driveways. Chapter 6 gives the Planning Commission the ability to waive, modify or increase those parking and driveway standards. There are no specific criteria to determine when a waiver of the requirements is appropriate; the Planning Commission does occasionally waive paved parking requirements. The parking standards are not burdensome and do not impact the cost of housing.
- The County's Land Development Regulations and the General Plan require all utility lines (gas, water, telephone, cable TV, electricity) to be installed underground. This requirement applies to individual development projects (a single-family residence, a single commercial use, a multifamily residence) as well as to subdivisions. Individual developments may apply for overhead installation. Overhead installation requires a Director Review permit unless the project itself requires a Use Permit; the overhead installation is then processed as part of the Use Permit. To approve an overhead installation, the Planning Director (for Director Review permits) or the Planning Commission (for Use Permits) must make the following findings in addition to the findings required for Director Review permits or Use Permits:

***Mono County Land Development Regulations, Chapter 11, Development Standards – Utilities:***

1. The overhead line placement will not significantly disrupt the visual character of the area. In making this determination, the director or the commission shall consider the following:
  - a. In areas without a number of existing overhead lines in the immediate vicinity, would overhead lines create the potential for a significant cumulative visual impact; i.e., would allowing an overhead line be likely to result in future requests for additional overhead lines in the area? If so, it may be determined that an overhead line will have a significant impact on the visual character of the area.
  - b. Does the topography or vegetation in the area effectively screen the proposed lines? If so, then an additional line may not significantly disrupt the visual character of the area.
  - c. Are there other potential alignments that would have less visual impact?
  - d. Does the project reduce the overall number of overhead lines and poles in the area? If so, it may be determined that an overhead line will not have a significant impact on the visual character of the area.

The director or the commission may consider additional information pertaining to the visual character of the area that is deemed relevant to the application.

2. The placement of utility lines above ground is environmentally preferable to underground placement. In making this determination, the director or the commission shall consider the following:
  - a. Will underground placement disturb an environmentally sensitive area, including but not limited to the following: cultural resource sites, significant wildlife habitat or use areas, riparian or wetland areas, or shallow groundwater? If so, above-ground placement may be preferable.
  - b. Will underground placement require disturbance of a waterway, including perennial, intermittent, and seasonal streams? If so, above ground placement may be preferable.
  - c. Will underground placement increase the utility line's exposure to environmental hazards, such as flood hazards, fault hazards or liquefaction? If so, above ground placement may be preferable.
  - d. Are there other potential alignments that would avoid potential environmental impacts?

The Director or the Commission may consider additional information pertaining to the environmental sensitivity of the area that is deemed relevant to the application.

3. The installation of underground utilities would create an unreasonable financial hardship on the applicant due to the unique physical characteristics of the property. In making this determination, the Director or the Commission shall consider the following:
  - a. Is the cost of the line to be installed excessive?
  - b. Will the installation of underground utilities require trenching under a stream bed?
  - c. Will the installation of underground utilities require unreasonable trenching or blasting through rock?
  - d. Are there alternate alignments that would eliminate or significantly lessen the financial hardship?

The Director or the Commission may consider other site specific financial hardships deemed relevant to the application.

4. The exclusive purpose of the overhead line is to serve an agricultural operation.

For the purposes of this section, agricultural operations are defined as use of the land for the production of food and fiber, including the growing of crops and grazing of livestock. Above ground utility lines may be permitted for agricultural uses such as pumps and similar uses.

Utility distribution lines for all subdivisions and land divisions shall be installed underground, unless a specific hardship can be demonstrated (see # 3 above). If a specific hardship can be demonstrated, overhead installation may be allowed subject to approval of a variance (see Ch. 33, Variance Processing).

Subdivisions may be required to underground the feeder distribution line to the subdivision. An assessment district, or a similar mechanism, may be established for this purpose as a condition of the tract map approval.

Underground installation of utility lines is generally not a hardship in community areas; it may be so in more rural areas where environmental constraints such as streambeds or rock formations make underground installation difficult and more costly. Mono County's regulations allow for overhead installation in such cases to alleviate the hardship and reduce the cost of housing.

- The County does not require public improvements such as streetlights and sidewalks due to the rural character of the County. Curbs and gutters are also not usually required.
- The County has no storm drainage infrastructure in any of its communities and does not require drainage improvements as a standard site improvement. Drainage requirements for projects are usually implemented to mitigate identified environmental impacts expected to result from the project. When required, drainage improvements are usually low-tech on-site retention basins.
- The County has no established exactions for landscaping or parks. Landscaping requirements for projects and requirements for the provision of parks or open space are sometimes required on a discretionary basis to mitigate identified environmental impacts expected to result from the project. When required, landscaping must comply with the County's requirements for Landscape Plans that promote xeriscape and the use of native drought-resistant species to the greatest extent practical.
- Additional on-site improvements may be required by the County's Fire Safe Regulations (Mono County Land Development Regulations, Chapter 22). The Fire Safe Regulations relate to emergency access, signing and building numbering, emergency water standards, and fuel modification standards. These standards are based on state law requirements, are not burdensome and do not add to the cost of housing. In addition, Chapter 22 allows the inspection authority to approve exceptions to the standards where "the exception provides the same overall practical effect as these regulations toward providing defensible space."
- Off-site development requirements for residential construction are generally limited to collection of school district fees and fire protection mitigation fees in areas within fire protection districts.
- The County's subdivision ordinance is based on the Subdivision Map Act. On-site improvements for subdivisions and land divisions may include the above requirements as well as additional requirements depending on the size and type of the proposed subdivision. For subdivisions, the General Plan includes policies to provide for additional off-site improvements or the collection of in-lieu fees to mitigate future development impacts on the environment and the local infrastructure.



- Due to the environmental sensitivity of much of the land in the County, additional development requirements may be imposed through the environmental review process on discretionary projects (this does not apply to the construction of a single-family residence by an individual). Additional development requirements to mitigate significant environmental impacts from a proposed project may increase the overall cost of the project, which may increase the cost of housing within the project.

## FEES AND EXACTIONS

Table 49 lists project development fees and building permit fees required by the County. The County may also require the following land dedications and exactions, depending on the location and type of the development: street rights of way, public utility easements, open space and trail dedications, snow storage easements, employee housing.

Fees are intended to cover the actual cost of services rendered. While they increase the cost of housing, they are not a constraint to development. The County streamlined its permit processing in order to expedite the development process and minimize the fees involved in a project.

Total fees for a typical single-family and multifamily development will vary depending on where in the County the project is located. Fire departments and school districts throughout the County charge different impact fees for development (see Table 49, Building Division Fees). Fees for an encroachment permit will vary depending on whether the property abuts a County road or a state highway. In addition, fees for sewer and water services will vary depending on whether the project is located in an area served by community sewer and water systems or whether it will require an individual well permit and septic system permit. Permit fees for septic systems vary depending on the type of system required.

Estimated initial fees for a typical 2,000-square foot single-family residence are shown below. Additional fees would be incurred for inspections and additional plan checks. Typical fees for a multifamily residential unit will be approximately 75 percent of the cost for a single-family residential unit (Rick McManis, Mono County Building Official).

### Estimated Total Fees for a Typical Single-family Residence

Assumptions: 2,000 square feet of habitable space in Chalfant; 400 square feet of garage; 100 square feet of uncovered deck. The unit requires an individual well permit and septic system permit. The unit encroaches on a County road.

Building permit fees	\$4,267.91	
Planning plan check	\$205.00	
Fire District (Chalfant)	\$1,991.00	
School District (Eastern Sierra)	\$3,120.00	
Encroachment Permit	\$800.00	(\$500 refundable security deposit)
Well Permit	\$460.00	

Septic Permit	\$540.00
Development Impact Fee	<u>\$2,692.00</u>
Total initial fees	\$14,075.91

## Table 49 Mono County Development Fees

Development fees are based on time and materials, and are deposits toward actual costs incurred by Mono County. Additional fees may accrue during permit processing.

### Fees Administered by Planning Division

Appeal	\$832	+ \$79/hr > 10 hours
Building Permit Plan Check*	\$205	+ \$79/hr > 2 hours
Categorical Exemption	\$77	+ \$79/hr > 1 hour
Certificate of Compliance	\$1,229	+ \$79/hr > 15 hours
Commission Interpretation	\$616	+ \$79/hr > 7 hours
Director Review	\$662	+ \$79/hr > 8 hours
Environmental Impact Report ** ***	\$2,149	+ \$79/hr > 27 hours
General Plan Amendment **	\$2,326	+ \$79/hr > 29 hours
Groundwater Extraction	\$1,432	+ \$79/hr > 18 hours
Hydrological Studies	\$429	+ \$79/hr > 5 hours
Lot Line Adjustment	\$1,583	+ \$79/hr > 20 hours
Lot Merger	\$681	+ \$79/hr > 8 hours
Map Extension	\$829	+ \$79/hr > 10 hours
Mining Operations Permit	\$1,432	+ \$79/hr > 18 hours
Negative Declaration or 15183 ***	\$1,370	+ \$79/hr > 17 hours
Parcel Map : Tentative	\$3,818	+ \$79/hr > 49 hours
Final	\$4,200	+ \$79/hr > 53 hours
Modification	\$2,660	+ \$79/hr > 33 hours
Reclamation Permit	\$1,432	+ \$79/hr > 38 hours
Specific Plan	\$3,045	+ \$79/hr > 38 hours
Time Shares	\$1,432	+ \$79/hr > 18 hours
Tract Map : Tentative	\$4,730	+ \$79/hr > 59 hours
Final	\$5,400	+ \$79/hr > 68 hours
Modification	\$3,122	+ \$79/hr > 39 hours
Use Permit	\$1,962	+ \$79/hr > 24 hours
Use Permit Modification	\$1,032	+ \$79/hr > 13 hours
Variance	\$1,202	+ \$79/hr > 15 hours
Williamson Act	\$200	+ \$79/hr > 2 hours

\* Planning Division review of building permit.

\*\* EIR fee is deposit for Initial Study only. Additional deposits may be assessed as needed on a case-by-case basis.

\*\*\* Additional CEQA fees required by California Department of Fish and Game: EIR = \$2,768.25 and Negative Declaration = \$1,993.

## Fees Administered by Public Works Department

---

Encroachment Permit	\$300 + \$500 Deposit
Grading Permit**	\$405
Solid Waste Fee Appeal	\$240

\*\* Indemnification Agreement required.

## Fees Administered by Building Division

---

### Building Permit Fee

Building fees are calculated based on the square footage of habitable space, garage, covered deck area, or uncovered deck area. Fees also vary depending on the complexity of the proposed building design and whether the structure is above or below 7000' elevation. Development Impact Fees apply in some areas of the County.

### School District mitigation fees

Bishop Unified School District	\$2.63 per square foot
Applies to Paradise Estates and Swall Meadows	
Mammoth Unified School District	\$2.63 per square foot
Applies to Crowley, Aspen Springs, Sunny Slopes, Alpers Ranch area	
Eastern Sierra Unified School District	\$1.56 per square foot
Applies to the rest of the County.	

### Fire District mitigation fees

Antelope Valley	\$1,266 per unit
Bridgeport	\$1,830 per unit
June Lake	\$832 flat fee
Lee Vining	\$0.50 per square foot
Long Valley	\$2,157 per unit
Mono City	\$0.50 per square foot
White Mountain	\$0.50 per square foot
Chalfant	\$1,991 per unit
Paradise	\$0.75 per square foot
Wheeler Crest	\$3,119 flat fee

### Public Utility District fees

Vary depending on district.

Hourly inspections	\$79 per hour
--------------------	---------------

## **Fees Administered by Environmental Health Department**

---

### **WELL PERMITS**

4666	Water Well Construction	\$460.00
4667	Water Well Destruction	\$77.00
4662	Monitoring Well Construction	\$150.00
4663	Monitoring Well Destruction	\$77.00
4669	Well Repair	\$150.00
	Well construction/destruction begun or completed w/o permit	
	Permit fee + 50% of permit fee	
4664	Permit Extension-1 yr-must be requested prior to expiration	\$38.00

### **SEPTIC PERMITS**

4201	New Septic System	\$540.00
4219	Major Repair (drain field and tank)	\$540.00
4220	Minor Repair (drain field or tank)	\$270.00
4213	Alternative System	\$1,500.00
4217	Engineered Individual System	\$690.00
4202	Commercial System (with WDR)	\$1,150.00
4203	Permit Extension-1 yr-must be requested prior to expiration	\$38.00
4204	Septic System Destruction	\$77.00
4206	Septic construction/destruction begun or completed w/o permit	
	Permit fee + 50% of permit fee	
4221	Annual Monitoring fee (where applicable)	\$77.00
4244	Septic & Chemical Toilet cleaning service-per vehicle	\$115.00

### **REAL ESTATE CERTIFICATIONS**

4672	Well Certification	\$150.00
4205	Septic System Certification	\$150.00
4601	Septic and Well at Same Site/Same Time	\$225.00

### **SMALL PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS**

4621	Community System 15-24 hookups	\$300.00
4622	Community System 25-99 hookups	\$540.00
4623	Community System 100-199 hookups	\$690.00
4633	Non-community Water System	\$460.00
4635	Non-Transient Non-Community Water System	\$460.00
4636	Community Water System Installation Permit	\$690.00
4637	Non-Community Water System Installation Permit	\$460.00
4638	Change of Ownership	\$230.00
4639	Permit Amendment	\$230.00
4644	State Small Water System 5-14 svc connections	\$150.00
4656	CURFFL Water System	\$38.00

## **DEVELOPMENT FEE INFORMATION**

Development fees are based on time and material, and are deposits toward actual costs incurred by Mono County. Additional fees may accrue during permit processing.

**SPECIAL FEES:** Research, inspections and services exceeding one-half hour for which no fee is specifically indicated shall be charged at direct cost including, but not limited to, hourly rate plus benefits and overhead, materials, copying, film and mileage, and shall not exceed the County's cost of providing such services.

**PENALTY:** Where work for which a permit is required by this code is started or continued without a permit, said permit shall be obtained along with applicable fees plus a penalty fee equal to the amount of such fees. Payment of such permit and penalty fee shall not relieve any persons from fully complying with the requirements of this code in execution of the work or requirements or from any other penalties prescribed by law.

**FEE PAYMENT:** Initial application fee is a deposit only toward actual costs of providing services. Should permit processing costs or services exceed initial deposit or payment, applicant and/or property may be billed for amount due or additional reasonable deposit (fee payment) for services not yet provided. Such billing shall be due no later than 15 days from postage date. In no event shall fees exceed the final cost of services by Mono County. Unless otherwise directed by the applicable department head or his designee, County may cease work on permits or services in process until fee payment is received, and such permits or services shall not become final until all fees have been paid.

**FEES APPLIED:** All fees listed are minimum deposits credited toward actual cost of services rendered. Such costs include, but are not limited to, hourly rate, postage, copying, mileage and overhead. Persons applying for services or permits shall pay a fee in an amount set by resolution of the Board of Supervisors, not to exceed the County's costs. Portions of deposit exceeding final actual costs shall be reimbursed to the person paying such fees.

**ENCROACHMENT PERMIT FEES:** In addition to the fee listed in the attached fee table, a refundable security deposit of \$500 is required for residential driveways. All other encroachment permits shall include the fee listed above plus 1.5% of the estimated construction cost. Acceptable performance surety may also be required.

**GRADING PERMIT FEE DEPOSIT:** In addition to the fee listed in the attached fee table, 1.5% of the estimated construction cost is due. Acceptable performance surety may also be required.

## **PROCESSING AND PERMITTING PROCEDURES**

Development in Mono County is typically individual single-family residential construction, which is subject to a building permit reviewed and approved by County staff. Approval of a building permit is contingent upon ensuring that the proposed development complies with the Mono County General Plan, including the Land Use Designations and the Land Development Regulations, and with applicable building regulations. Development occurring on or adjacent to environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands or streamsides may also be subject to permit requirements of other state and federal agencies (see Land Use Requirements Imposed by Other Agencies).

Mono County does not typically have multifamily development projects. Duplexes and triplexes are permitted in many multifamily land use designations and are subject to the building permit process described above. Developments with four or more units have been subject to the Use Permit process. However, the County has included a program in this Housing Element to replace the Use Permit with a ministerial Director Review.

Residential subdivision projects in Mono County occur infrequently. Several small lot splits may occur within developed community areas each year and are subject to the parcel map permitting process (see Table 50). Large subdivision projects are subject to the specific plan and EIR process (see Table 50); one or two such projects may occur in a year. Typically, in Mono County the land is subdivided, and the lots are sold undeveloped.

Mono County has streamlined its permit processing procedures and processes all required permits and or required legislative changes (such as General Plan Amendments) concurrently. This shortens the project review time and expedites the approval process. Information and permit application forms are available online. The County has a **Building/Planning Guide: Buying and Developing Property in Mono County** available online that is designed to assist builders and homeowners through the development process. It includes information on land development regulations, building requirements, and various types of permits. The County also has a Land Development Technical Advisory Committee (LDTAC), comprised of members of the Community Development staff, Public Works staff, and Environmental Health staff, that meets with project proponents early on in the development permitting process to address project concerns and ensure the project meets all development and environmental criteria.

The **Mono County Environmental Handbook** is also available online. The Environmental Handbook is intended to facilitate the day-to-day evaluation of discretionary projects within the unincorporated area by establishing procedures to identify, review and evaluate environmental aspects of projects and by encouraging the incorporation of environmental considerations into the project conceptualization, design, and planning at the earliest feasible time.

Table 50 shows typical processing times for various permit procedures. Individual single-family residential development that requires only a building permit or a Director Review permit takes only four to six weeks. Larger projects, such as subdivisions, take longer, depending on the level of CEQA review required, the responsiveness of project proponents, and whether the project requires permits from other state or federal agencies.

All development projects are first reviewed by staff. Projects requiring discretionary approval from the Planning Director, the Planning Commission, or the Board of Supervisors are first processed by staff and then presented to the appropriate entity for approval. Projects are reviewed for their compliance with the Mono County General Plan, the Mono County Code, the Mono County Land Development Regulations, and applicable state and federal laws.

The standards of decisionmaking are well established and not burdensome. In issuing a Director Review permit, the director must find that all of the following are true (Mono County Land Development Regulations, Chapter 31):

- A. All applicable provisions of Land Use Designations and Land Development Regulations are complied with, and the site of the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use and to accommodate all yards, walls and fences, parking, loading, landscaping and other required features.
- B. The site for the proposed use relates to streets and highways adequate in width and type to carry the quantity and kind of traffic generated by the proposed use.
- C. The proposed use will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the area in which the property is located.
- D. The proposed use is consistent with the map and text of this General Plan and any applicable area plan.
- E. That the improvements as indicated on the development plan are consistent with all adopted standards and policies as set forth in the Land Development Regulations, this General Plan and any applicable area plan.
- F. That the project is exempt from CEQA.

Use permits may be granted by the Planning Commission only when all of the following findings can be made in the affirmative (Mono County Land Development Regulations, Chapter 32):

- A. All applicable provisions of the Land Use Designations and Land Development Regulations are complied with, and the site of the proposed use is adequate in size and shape to accommodate the use and to accommodate all yards, walls and fences, parking, loading, landscaping and other required features.
- B. The site for the proposed use relates to streets and highways adequate in width and type to carry the quantity and kind of traffic generated by the proposed use.
- C. The proposed use will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to property or improvements in the area in which the property is located.
- D. The proposed use is consistent with the map and text of this General Plan and any applicable area plan.



**Table 50 Timelines for Permit Procedures**

Type of Approval or Permit	Typical Processing Time
Building Permit (including Design Review where required)	4 - 6 weeks
Director Review permit	45 days
Conditional Use Permit	3 months
Parcel Map	4 months
Tract Map	5 months
General Plan Amendment	4 months
Lot Line Adjustment	2 months
Lot Line Merger	45 days
Variance	3 months
Specific Plan	9 - 12 months
Initial Study/Negative Declaration	3 months
Environmental Impact Report	9 -12 months
<i>Source: Mono County Community Development Department.</i>	

**CONSTRAINTS ON PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES**

State housing law requires local jurisdictions to provide "reasonable accommodation" (i.e., "modifications and exceptions") for people with disabilities in their development regulations, permit processing, and building regulations and processes. Mono County's housing development policies and procedures comply with the requirements of SB 520 (Potential Constraints on Housing for Persons with Disabilities); i.e.,

*Overall*

- The County provides reasonable accommodation concerning development regulations, permit processing, and building regulations for persons with disabilities. The Building Official has the discretion to provide flexible interpretations of building codes. The Community Development Director is also provided some flexibility in expediting permit processing and interpreting development standards such as setbacks.
- Requests for reasonable accommodation are made directly to the Building Official (building issues) or the Community Development Director (planning/development regulations issues). For planning/development regulations issues, if the issue is beyond the authority of the Community Development Director, the item is taken to the Planning Commission for interpretation. The Community Development Department also encourages free preapplication conferences to clarify and work through disability design standards.
- Regional social service agencies (Mono County Social Services, IMACA, IMAAA, Kern Regional Center) work with low-income, disabled and senior clients on an individual basis to retrofit their homes with ramps and other assistance devices. These projects at the most will require a building permit from the County.

- The County reviewed all its land development regulations (zoning code), General Plan policies and building and planning procedures for compliance with fair housing law during the update of the Mono General Plan Land Use Element in 2004. Where necessary, the regulations, policies, or procedures were amended to ensure compliance. The Community Development Director also has the discretion to provide some flexibility in adjusting development standards to accommodate special situations.
- The County continues to strongly advocate that Caltrans include ADA improvements in Caltrans projects (e.g., ADA standard sidewalk improvements, crosswalks, etc.) along state highways that serve as main streets through communities and that provide access to housing.
- The County provides information about requesting a reasonable accommodation with regard to development standards, permit processing, and/or building regulations and processes through a variety of formats. Information is available online at the Mono County Government website ([www.monoCounty.ca.gov](http://www.monoCounty.ca.gov)) and at permit counters at the County offices in Bridgeport and Mammoth Lakes. The County also provides free consultations with building, planning and compliance staff regarding requests for reasonable accommodation. The County also provides information on funding programs for home retrofits administered by IMAAA and IMACA.
- Mono County allows group homes consistent with state law. The County, however, has no existing group homes and has had no applications for group homes. Due to the limited number of disabled persons in the County and the physical distance between communities, assistance for disabled persons usually occurs on an individual basis.

### ***Zoning and Land Use***

- The County reviewed all its land development regulations (zoning code), General Plan policies and building and planning procedures for compliance with fair housing law during the update of the Mono County General Plan Land Use Element in 2004. Where necessary, the regulations, policies, or procedures were amended to ensure compliance.
- The Mono County Land Development Parking Regulations provide specific parking standards for persons with disabilities in compliance with state and federal ADA requirements. The County's parking regulations also allow for a reduction in the parking requirements for special needs housing if a project proponent can demonstrate a reduced need for parking.
- Mono County does not restrict the siting of group homes.
- All land use designations that allow residential development also allow group homes. Mono County has no additional regulations regarding group homes.
- The Mono County Land Development Regulations do not have occupancy standards that apply specifically to unrelated adults and not to families.
- The Mono County Land Use Element does not regulate the siting of special needs housing in relationship to one another; there are no minimum distance requirements between special needs housing units.

- The County implements and monitors Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations that requires access and adaptability for persons with disabilities. These regulations apply to new construction of multifamily units in buildings with three or more units.

### ***Permits and Processing***

- As mentioned previously, regional social service agencies (Mono County Social Services, IMACA, IMAAA, Kern Regional Center) work with low-income, disabled, and senior clients on an individual basis to retrofit their homes with ramps and other assistive devices. These projects at the most will require a building permit from the County. At the time of a request to retrofit a home for accessibility, the County provides consultation on building code requirements, information/handouts concerning the building permit process, and flexibility in interpreting building code requirements when necessary.
- Mono County allows group homes with fewer than six persons by right in single-family residential zones; they are treated as common single-family residences. A group home with fewer than six persons would require a building permit and, in some circumstances, a ministerial Director Review permit.
- Mono County has no conditions or use restrictions for group homes with greater than six persons.
- The County does not allow any community input for the approval of group homes other than general policy discussions at Regional Planning Advisory Committee meetings. This is no different than other types of residential development.
- The County has no specific conditions that address group homes that will be providing services on-site. However, depending on the nature of those services, specific conditions from the County's Land Development Regulations may apply (e.g., parking requirements). These conditions would be subject to discretionary interpretation as discussed previously and would not affect the development or conversion of residences to meet the needs of persons with disabilities.

### ***Building Codes***

- Mono County adopts the most current version of the Uniform Building Code. The County has made no amendments to the UBC that would diminish the County's ability to accommodate persons with disabilities.
- The County has not adopted any universal design elements in the building code other than those related to snow loads and climatic conditions.
- The County provides reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities in the enforcement of building codes and the issuance of building permits (see prior discussion).

## C. NON-GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

The availability and cost of housing is influenced by market factors over which the County has no control. Land costs, site development/construction costs, and the availability of financing affect housing development and cannot be greatly lessened by the County.

### LAND COSTS

There is no one average cost per acre for land in Mono County because the demand for land and the type of lot/site available vary greatly throughout the County. Costs for vacant land may also vary depending on whether community utilities are available to the site and whether infrastructure (access roads, utility lines) is installed on site. Recent sales activity for lots has been sparse; the following estimates of land costs are based on the professional knowledge of appraisers utilized by the Mono County Assessors Office. Generally, in areas with few undeveloped parcels for sale, there are many houses for sales, including mobile homes. Land costs, along with housing costs, have risen significantly in the last several years, although the past year has seen reductions from the peak prices.

- **Antelope Valley**  
Undeveloped land available in the Antelope Valley is predominantly large-lot residential parcels over one acre in size. There are also some parcels over 10 acres in size. The average price per acre was \$65,000. There are a few parcels for sale each year; the majority of them are usually in Walker.
- **Bridgeport Valley**  
Undeveloped land available in the Bridgeport Valley ranges from small town lots (0.55 to 1 acres) to multiple-acre parcels (approximately 40 acres) to large agriculturally zoned parcels (240 to 320 acres). The average price for a small town lot would be \$85,000; for a one acre parcel, \$200,000; for a 40+ acre parcel, \$6000 per acre; and for 100+ acres, \$3,300 per acre.
- **Mono Basin**  
Very few parcels are available for sale in the Mono Basin; over 90 percent of the parcels available have been sold. Undeveloped land available in the Mono Basin ranges from small lots (0.25 to 0.73 acres) to multiple-acre parcels (20 to 120 acres). The price for a lot in Mono City, where most undeveloped land is located, averages \$65,000.
- **June Lake**  
Undeveloped land available in June Lake is predominantly lots under one acre in size, with many of the lots being small town lots under one-quarter acre in size. The average price for lots under an acre in size is \$17,500. The average price for all lots is \$200,000.

- **Long Valley/Wheeler Crest**  
Undeveloped land available in Long Valley/Wheeler Crest varies widely, ranging from 0.5 to 2 acres in size with very few larger parcels ranging from 10 to 30 acres in size. Costs vary widely depending on the location of the parcel. Average costs in the Wheeler Crest area (Swall Meadows, Hilltop Ranch, Rimrock Ranch, or Pinon Ranch) are \$122,00-\$135,000 per acre. Average costs in Sunny Slopes are \$75,000 per acre; in Sierra Springs, \$450,000 per acre; and in Crowley, \$200,000-\$250,000 per acre.
- **Tri-Valley**  
Undeveloped land available in the Tri-Valley is predominantly large parcels ranging in size from 10-acre residential parcels to agriculturally zoned parcels (694 acres). Several subdivisions have been approved in Chalfant but the lots are not yet available for sale. The average price for a residential acre in the Tri-Valley is estimated to be \$85,000.

## **CONSTRUCTION COSTS**

Construction costs are estimated to range from \$150 to \$250 per square foot for single-family residential construction in the unincorporated area of Mono County (Rick McManis, Mono County Building Official). These costs include land, fees, materials, labor and financing. Due to the wide range of land costs, fees and development requirements throughout the County, it is very difficult to estimate a "typical" total development cost for single-family residential development.

## **AVAILABILITY OF FINANCING**

The cost of borrowing money to finance the construction of housing or to purchase a home has a large impact on the amount of housing constructed and purchased. Financing is now generally available to Mono County residents at competitive rates. Lower interest rates are making it feasible for households with more moderate incomes to construct or purchase homes.

There are a number of government-assisted loan programs to enable low- and moderate-income households to construct or purchase housing. These programs are generally available to Mono County residents:

- **U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insured loans.**  
This program generally has higher approval rates than conventional loans, particularly for lower- or moderate-income households. The FHA program helps low- and moderate-income families by lowering some of their mortgage loan costs. The property must meet certain minimum requirements for manufactured homes, single-family homes or multifamily homes.

- **U.S. Department of Agriculture's Rural Development Rural Housing Service programs.**

The Rural Housing Service offers a variety of assistance programs to support low-income households purchasing homes in rural areas. Rural Housing Direct Loans are directly funded by the USDA and are available to low- and very low-income households to construct or purchase a home. Housing Guaranteed Loans are administered by a variety of entities and are available to moderate income households that could not obtain credit elsewhere.

- **California Department of Housing and Community Development programs.**

CalHome Program provides grants to public agencies and nonprofit developers to assist individual households with deferred-payment loans and direct, forgivable loans to assist development projects involving multiple ownership units, including single-family subdivisions.

California Self-Help Housing Program provides grants to sponsor organizations that provide training and supervision of low- and moderate-income self-help homebuilders.

- **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) programs.**

Programs administered by the state and federal housing departments that provide funding for housing activities, generally for lower-income households in rural areas. Housing activities may include single and multifamily rehabilitation, rental housing acquisition, homeownership assistance, activities that complement new construction, and housing planning activities.

- **Mammoth Lakes Housing, Inc (MLH).**

Mammoth Lakes Housing, Inc. (MLH), in conjunction with Mono County, has homebuyer's assistance funds available to households with an income at or below 80% Area Median Income (AMI). MLH guidelines state that the household purchasing a home must be a first-time homebuyer, in accordance with the HUD definition of first-time homebuyer. Homebuyer's assistance funds are subordinate to the primary loan. Interest is accrued over the life of the loan at zero to three percent (0-3%) with no monthly payment required. Once the primary loan is paid in full the MLH loan becomes due and begins to accrue interest at three percent (3%). The primary loan must be a thirty-year, fixed rate, fully amortized loan. MLH also has the option of profit sharing on market rate units.

## **UNITS AT RISK OF CONVERSION TO MARKET RATE USES**

Mono County does not have any multifamily rental housing that could be converted to market rate rents. The only "restricted" affordable housing units in the unincorporated area are the following:

- One condominium dwelling unit in June Lake, owned by Mono County, rented to low-income residents, reserved as an employee-housing unit. This unit is deed restricted.
- Thirty-six dwelling units at Camp Antelope, operated by the nonprofit Owens Valley Housing Authority, and reserved for Native Americans. These units are single-family attached and detached units.

## **ENERGY CONSERVATION**

Housing elements must analyze "... opportunities for energy conservation with respect to residential development" (Section 65583 (a)(7)) to ensure that localities consider the long term and short term benefits of energy conservation in residential development, including how energy conservation requirements can contribute to reducing overall development costs and monthly payments for households.

Mono County General Plan policies currently address the potential for energy conservation in both new residential development and remodeling, i.e.:

### ***Planning and Land Use Issues***

- Mono County's Land Use Element and Housing Element provide for an adequate supply of housing for all income groups in existing community areas in order to reduce commutes.
- Mono County's Land Use Element provides for higher density residential development, and infill development, in community areas in order to reduce impacts to the environment, including energy consumption.
- Mono County's Conservation/Open Space Element policies allow the use of alternative energy sources (such as photovoltaic systems) and promote water efficient landscaping and energy efficient irrigation systems

### ***Conservation Incentives for the Building Industry and Residents***

- Mono County's Land Use Element and Housing Element provide for an adequate supply of housing for all income groups in existing community areas in order to reduce commutes.
- Mono County's Land Use Element provides for higher density residential development in community areas in order to reduce impacts to the environment, including energy consumption.
- Mono County's Conservation/Open Space Element provides density bonuses for residential and commercial projects using passive or active solar heating/cooling. A 10 percent density bonus may be allowed for each 25 percent reduction in space and water heating/cooling demand.



- Additional policies and programs in the Conservation/Open Space Element encourage energy conservation, including weatherization programs.
- The Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA) administers a weatherization program for low-income persons. Although the program provides \$5,000 of weatherization assistance for qualified persons, it is not highly utilized (Daniel Steinhagen, IMACA).
- The California Department of Community Services and Development (CSD) administers the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) Block Grant, funded by the federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). The program provides two basic types of services. Eligible low-income persons, via local governmental and nonprofit organizations, can receive financial assistance to offset the costs of heating and/or cooling dwellings, and/or have their dwellings weatherized to make them more energy efficient. This is accomplished through three program components:
  1. The ***Weatherization Program*** provides free weatherization services to improve the energy efficiency of homes, including attic insulation, weatherstripping, minor housing repairs, and related energy conservation measures.
  2. The ***Home Energy Assistance Program (HEAP)*** provides financial assistance to eligible households to offset the costs of heating and/or cooling dwellings.
  3. The ***Energy Crisis Intervention Program (ECIP)*** provides payments for weather-related or energy-related emergencies.
- Southern California Edison (SCE), the electric energy provider throughout the County, administers a number of programs designed to help all customers conserve energy and to lower costs for low-income customers. These programs include the following:
  1. The ***Low-Income Energy Efficiency Program*** provides services, or "measures," designed to help low-income households conserve energy and reduce their electricity costs. SCE pays all the cost of purchasing and installing the measures, which are free to eligible customers.
  2. The ***Energy Assistance Fund*** helps qualified customers in financial hardship with winter electric bills.
  3. If you or a full-time resident in your home require the regular use of electrically operated life-support equipment, you may be eligible for a ***Medical Baseline Allocation*** that allows you to be billed at a lower rate for your electric service.
  4. ***CARE*** provides a 20% discount on utility rates and charges at a customer's primary home. To qualify, you must meet all income eligibility guidelines, hold the utility account in your name, and not be claimed as a dependent by any other person living in the residence.
  5. Save money and conserve energy by joining ***SCE's Residential Air Conditioner Cycling Program (ACCP)***, in which you receive a credit on your summer season electric bills.



6. SCE offers a free do-it-yourself *home energy survey*. This provides recommendations and practical steps to reduce energy costs and improve the energy efficiency of your home.
7. SCE also maintains an extensive *online library of energy-saving tips* ([www.sce.com](http://www.sce.com)) and conducts public outreach to promote conservation and provide information on low-income assistance options.

***Promoting Green Building and Energy Efficient Building Standards and Practices***

- All new development in unincorporated Mono County, and major remodeling, such as home additions, must comply with the Title 24 of the California Administrative Energy Code. Title 24 implements energy efficiency standards relating to wall and ceiling insulation, thermal mass, and window-to-floor area ratios designed to reduce heat loss and energy consumption.

## IV. PROGRESS REPORT

---

### HOUSING LAW REQUIREMENTS

This section reviews housing programs from the existing Housing Element to evaluate the progress made in achieving those programs, to determine the effectiveness of the programs, and to describe what has been learned from the analysis. Specifically, the review addresses the following:

1. **Effectiveness of the element:** A description of the actual results or outcomes of the prior element's goals (i.e., what happened), objectives, policies, and programs. The results should be quantified where possible (e.g., number of units rehabilitated) and may be qualitative where necessary (e.g., mitigation of governmental constraints).
2. **Progress in implementation:** For each program, the analysis should compare significant differences between what was projected or planned in the earlier element and what was achieved. Analyze the differences to determine where the previous housing element met, exceeded, or fell short of what was anticipated.
3. **Appropriateness of goals, policies and programs:** A description of what has been learned based on the analysis of progress and effectiveness of the previous element. A description of how the goals, objectives, policies, and programs in the updated element are being changed or adjusted to incorporate what has been learned from the results of the previous element.

## PROGRESS REPORT 2004 HOUSING ELEMENT

### PROVISION OF ADEQUATE SITES

Program 1 Pursue land exchanges of existing seasonal housing units on public lands into private ownership so those units may become available for local year-round housing.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Mono County, in partnership with Inyo County and the Collaborative Planning Team<sup>1</sup> has secured a grant through the Sierra Nevada Conservancy to prepare a Land Tenure Master Plan for the Eastern Sierra region. Initiation of that process was delayed as a result of funding freezes but the process is now slated to begin. Concurrently, County staff have been working with the homeowners associations from seasonal housing on US Forest Service land to initiate land exchanges. Staff are now awaiting further direction from the land tenure master plan process.**

---

<sup>1</sup> This multi-agency planning team, which consists of federal, state and local agencies, meets monthly to collaborate on a variety of planning issues for the Eastern Sierra. The CPT philosophy recognizes that the synergistic effect of team collaboration as a whole will far exceed that which individual team members may accomplish on their own.

**EFFECTIVENESS:** The process has begun but has been slowed by staff turnover within the Forest Service and the subsequent implementation of the land tenure planning process.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM:** Program remains ongoing through 2014. Following completion of the land tenure planning process, County staff will prioritize possible land exchanges in areas with existing seasonal housing and follow through with the land exchange process.

Program 2 Inventory existing and/or potential agency housing areas (Mono County, Town of Mammoth Lakes, Southern Mono Hospital District, Mammoth Unified School District, USFS, BLM, Caltrans, LADWP, etc.) and work with agencies to assess where additional housing might be made available.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2004.

**PROGRESS:** Mono County has completed an inventory of County land available for housing.

**EFFECTIVENESS:** The program is partially completed.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM:** Program remains ongoing through 2014. The land tenure planning process should inventory land owned by other agencies that might be available for residential development.

Program 3 Work with public agencies (USFS, BLM, Caltrans, LADWP, etc.) to consolidate services and land uses (e.g., road shops) in order to free up land for housing, particularly affordable housing. Consistent with land use policies, encourage agencies to locate their housing within or adjacent to existing communities to facilitate sustainable community growth.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Public Works Department, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: 2004-2005.

**PROGRESS:** The County has completed a Facilities Needs Assessment, identifying Countywide facilities needs for the future. That assessment includes the need for workforce housing in communities throughout the County and examines the need to replace and consolidate County facilities such as road shops.

**EFFECTIVENESS:** The program is partially completed.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM:** Program remains ongoing through 2014. Following completion of the land tenure planning process, the focus will be on working with public agencies to free up land for housing.

Program 4 Examine the inventory of County-owned land for potential housing sites (e.g., road shop sites, Conway Ranch, Sheriff Substation, etc).

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2004.

**PROGRESS:** Mono County has completed an inventory of County land available for housing. That inventory is available in a GIS format on the County's

website. The County has completed an initial evaluation of how available some of the land is for housing and continues to verify the status of some sites.

**EFFECTIVENESS:** In progress.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM:** By 2010, the County will complete its assessment of which County-owned land is available for development and will map the results, showing what type of development is allowed on each parcel identified and the availability of infrastructure on-site.

Program 5 Study the possibility of acquiring/exchanging public lands surrounding existing community areas for community expansion purposes and/or related infrastructure development, particularly in those areas designated in the Land Use Element for community expansion. Based on the results of these studies, take necessary actions to promote the exchange of lands and encourage the development of a variety of housing types, including multifamily for lower-income households in the acquisition/exchange of public lands.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing.

**PROGRESS:** Mono County, in partnership with Inyo County and the Collaborative Planning Team has secured a grant through the Sierra Nevada Conservancy to prepare a Land Tenure Master Plan for the Eastern Sierra region.

**EFFECTIVENESS:** The process is not complete.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM:** Program remains ongoing through 2014. Following completion of the land tenure planning process, County staff will prioritize possible land exchanges.

Program 6 Implement policies in the Land Use Element pertaining to the provision of services and the coordination of development with service capability. Work with local service providers (public utility districts, fire protection districts, gas/electric power providers, telephone/communications systems providers, etc.) to ensure that adequate services are or will be available for housing development.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Environmental Health.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS:** This is an ongoing process; the County does not allow higher density development unless public services are available or can be developed for the project. The County has recently helped obtain grants to upgrade fire protection services, EMS services, and water tanks in various communities.

**EFFECTIVENESS:** Successful.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM:** Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.

Program 7 Encourage and assist special districts to secure grants to improve and expand sewer and water capabilities and fire protection services. The County's

participation will entail aiding districts in the preparation of grant applications and in compliance with environmental requirements.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Environmental Health Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This is an ongoing process. As noted for the previous program, the County has helped local agencies to obtain grants for improvements to their facilities.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. The program will be amended to include small private service providers, as well as special districts, since Mono County has a number of small, private community water and sewer providers.**

Program 8 Identify sites for emergency shelters in this Housing Element. Monitor the need for permanent emergency shelters. Apply for emergency housing funds available from the Department of Housing and Community Development or other state or federal agencies when it is determined that there is an unmet need for emergency housing.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Housing Authority.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: The County has identified its community centers as emergency shelters. The County has obtained funds to upgrade emergency generators at each site and to obtain an emergency services trailer for each community.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. The Mono County Housing Authority along with the Office of Emergency Services will be responsible for implementing this program.**

Program 9 Ensure that the County's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan, prepared by the County's Office of Emergency Services, remains up-to-date. The Multi-Hazard Functional Plan contains policies and procedures for housing victims of natural hazards or accidents.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Office of Emergency Services.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: The Multi-Hazard Functional Plan has not been updated since its adoption.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: -----**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. The program will be to pursue grant funding for an update.**

Program 10 Continue to provide short-term housing for homeless persons.

Responsible Agencies: Department of Social Services, IMACA.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This is an ongoing process. Short-term housing is provided through a voucher system.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. This program will be combined with Program 11 below.**

Program 11 Monitor the need to increase services for homeless persons.

Responsible Agencies: Department of Social Services, IMACA.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This is an ongoing process.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. This program will be combined with Program 10 above.**

Program 12 Establish a Regional Housing Authority or similar entity to develop, implement and manage housing programs in Mono County and the Eastern Sierra. The housing authority should address regional housing programs, including those for the County, the town of Mammoth Lakes, agencies (e.g., USFS, BLM, Caltrans, special districts, LADWP), and special-needs groups (e.g., disabled, seniors).

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: 2004-2005.

**PROGRESS: The Mono County Housing Authority has been established. The County is now in the process of developing a strategic plan for staffing the agency.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: This program has been completed and will be deleted from the element.**

Program 13 Implement housing policies contained in area plans, such as the June Lake Area Plan.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This is an ongoing process.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments are proposed.**

Program 14 Consistent with the Land Use Element, continue to require specific plans for large-scale development within community expansion areas. Specific plans

allow for a variety of development and can streamline the development process.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This is an ongoing process. Over the last 3-4 years, Specific Plans have been adopted or are in the process for large-scale developments in Chalfant (White Mountain Estates, Mountain Vistas), Paradise (Rock Creek Ranch), and June Lake (Rodeo Grounds, workforce housing).**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments are proposed.**

Program 15 In conformance with state law, continue to permit manufactured housing on all parcels zoned for conventional single-family residences.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This is an ongoing process.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. The program will be amended to state “designated for conventional single-family residences” instead of “zoned...”.**

Program 16 Continue to permit mobile-home parks on all land planned and designated for residential land use, in conformance with state law. This also applies to mobile-home developments intended for sale as mobile-home condos or cooperative parks, or as mobile-home planned unit developments.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This is an ongoing process.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments are proposed.**

Program 17 Continue to implement the land development regulations regarding Manufactured Housing Subdivisions. These regulations provide for a higher density of single-family development and a relaxation of development standards.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This is an ongoing process. Osage Circle in Chalfant, with 13 units, is completely manufactured housing, although it is not higher density.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**



Program 18 Support a balance of jobs and housing in Mono County communities and the associated reduction in resident commute times by facilitating community job growth through economic development programs. Pursue grant funding for economic development projects that grow jobs and healthy communities capable of supporting more resident housing.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This is an ongoing process. The County formed an Economic Development Department to support this effort.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: -----**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 19 Pursue a master land adjustment planning program to expand the private land base within or immediately adjacent to existing communities lacking a sufficient private land base for housing. The land adjustment program, which is coordinated through the Collaborative Planning Team, also seeks to reduce private in-holdings in open space or resource management areas outside community areas.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: As noted previously, Mono County, in partnership with Inyo County and the Collaborative Planning Team has secured a grant through the Sierra Nevada Conservancy to prepare a Land Tenure Master Plan for the Eastern Sierra region. Initiation of that process was delayed as a result of funding freezes but the process is now slated to begin.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: In process.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: This program is being implemented and will be deleted from the element.**

Program 20 Consider amending the General Plan and Subdivision Ordinance to permit smaller minimum lot sizes where consistent with area plans and available infrastructure.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This provision is currently contained in the General Plan; the subdivision ordinance is in the process of being revised.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful. Smaller lot sizes have been allowed in subdivisions where water and wastewater system allowed smaller lot sizes.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM. Ongoing. The program will be amended to reflect that the General Plan and Subdivision Ordinance have been amended and to focus on continuing to implement this provision.**

Program 21 Reexamine residential limitations in area plans where new sewer, water or other infrastructure requirements, such as fire-flow requirements, allow for



greater single-family densities. Consider amending the General Plan and area plans to allow for higher single-family densities in these areas.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This program is similar to Program 20 above. The Municipal Service Reviews, recently completed by LAFCO for special districts within the County, contain information on infrastructure requirements in many community areas.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Ongoing.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM. Ongoing. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 22 Continue to allow for mixed-use development as a method of increasing the land base available for housing.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: The County continues to allow mixed-use development.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Ongoing.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM. Ongoing. No adjustments proposed.**

ong

Program 23 Continue to allow for residential development in the commercial land use designation to more efficiently and economically utilize our limited land base for housing.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: The County continues to allow residential development in commercial land use designations.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Ongoing.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM. Ongoing. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 24 Consider amending the General Plan and subdivision ordinance to allow for greater flexibility in subdivision design to encourage clustering, zero lot line and common-wall developments, and other residential design strategies that allow for development at the gross allowable density while preserving sensitive site features.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: The County's Land Development Regulations in the General Plan have been amended to allow clustering in a variety of residential designations. That provision has then been implemented in the Rock Creek Ranch Specific Plan, currently in development. Other development standards, such as setback and parking requirements have been amended to provide for greater flexibility in residential design. The County is currently in the process of revising its Subdivision Ordinance.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM. This program is ongoing. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 25 Examine the potential of allowing additional densities in existing specific plan areas within or adjacent to communities to better utilize available infrastructure and limited private land base.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: At least one community, Lee Vining, is considering this due to its extremely limited private land base.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Ongoing.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM. Ongoing. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 26 Consider establishing minimum allowable densities (in addition to retaining maximum density restrictions) in appropriate community areas to encourage resident housing.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: The County is still considering this for specific projects.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: -----**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM. Ongoing. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 27 In concert with other agencies in the region, assess commuting and employment patterns in the Eastern Sierra to determine the level of the imbalance between job locations and housing locations. Use this assessment as a basis for adjustments to planning and transportation policies to achieve a jobs/housing balance consistent with state law. (Note: Mono County, Inyo County and the Town of Mammoth Lakes are in the process of combining recent CDBG grant awards to conduct such a study.)

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Inyo County, Town of Mammoth Lakes.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: The County, along with Inyo County and the Town of Mammoth Lakes, authorized a housing collaborative study/needs assessment. The results of that study led to the formation of the Mono County Housing Authority and the Mono County Housing Mitigation Ordinance.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Completed.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM. This program has been completed and will be deleted.**

Program 28 Continue development credit programs in agricultural valleys such as Bridgeport and Hammil that promote the retention of large agricultural parcels for farming purposes by requiring clustered residential development on smaller parcels. To further promote housing development, consider amending the Land Use Element to clarify development credit programs, including their inapplicability to genuine farm labor housing projects, and their ability to transfer development credits to off-site parcels more suitable for development.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.  
Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS:** The County is in the process of examining several components of the Development Credit Program including allowed land uses, clarifying the process, the issue of farm labor housing, and the process of transferring development credits to off-site parcels more suitable for development. Once the study is completed, the Land Use Element will be amended to reflect applicable changes in the Development Credit Program. The Land Use Maps will also be amended to include the allowed development credits on each applicable parcel on the land use maps.

**EFFECTIVENESS:** Use of the Development Credit Program is ongoing and successful. The program is in the process of being amended to clarify several aspects of it.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM.** None proposed. Reference to amending the Development Credit Program will be deleted since that is currently in process.

Program 29 Consider providing incentives and/or instituting other methods of encouraging second-home owners to make vacation units available for resident use or seasonal employee housing.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.  
Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS:** This program has not been done.

**EFFECTIVENESS:** -----

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM.** The Mono County Housing Authority will become the implementing agency for this program. The program will be strengthened by amending it to connect second-home owners and those needing seasonal housing.

Program 30 Consider alternative methodologies that include projected job creation and existing jobs-housing imbalances for allocating regional housing needs to unincorporated communities. (Note: This policy is recommended in response to the concerns of the Antelope Valley Regional Planning Advisory Committee.)

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.  
Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS:** The County has typically used population percentages to allocate regional housing needs to the communities in unincorporated Mono County.

**EFFECTIVENESS:** -----

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM.** The County will no longer allocate its regional housing needs to communities. This program will be deleted. Programs addressing low income housing will be amended to state that the County will utilize a variety of factors, not just population, when considering the placement of affordable housing throughout the county.

Program 31 To facilitate multifamily development, establish a ministerial process such as Director Review permits to allow multifamily in multifamily designations and designations such as MFR-M and MFR-H.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2004-2005.

**PROGRESS: The County utilizes the Director Review process to allow multifamily development in multifamily designations.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM. This program will be amended to focus on continuing to use the Director Review process to allow multifamily development in multifamily designations.**

Program 32 In order to clarify permit processes for emergency shelters and transitional housing, revise land use regulations to define emergency shelters and transitional housing as group homes.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2004-2005.

**PROGRESS: Not implemented.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Not implemented. Mono County has identified its community centers as emergency shelters; the County also has emergency services trailers in each community. Due to the low population levels, great distances between community areas, and lack of social services in several communities, a need for transitional housing outside of the Town of Mammoth Lakes has not been identified. County staff do not anticipate a need for transitional housing or additional emergency shelters within the planning period.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM. Although Mono County does not have a need for additional emergency shelters or transitional housing, this program will remain ongoing.**

## HOUSING FOR LOW AND MODERATE INCOMES

Program 1 The Board of Supervisors shall award density bonuses for projects incorporating affordable housing consistent with the Government Code.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Mono County has awarded density bonuses to projects incorporating affordable housing (e.g. Rock Creek Ranch), in compliance with the Mono County Housing Mitigation Ordinance.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. The program will be amended to reflect that density bonuses for projects with affordable housing are consistent with the Mono County Housing Mitigation Ordinance (Chapter 15.40, Mono County Code).**

Program 2-The Board of Supervisors may reduce or waive development processing fees for qualifying affordable housing projects in order to facilitate processing. Promote similar fee reductions and waivers by other agencies and special districts.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Mono County has waived development impact fees for qualifying projects.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. To strengthen the program, staff will 1) identify other agencies/districts with fees related to residential construction, 2) identify if those agencies waive or reduce fees for affordable housing units, and 3) work with those agencies to promote a reduction or waiving of fees for affordable housing projects.**

Program 3 Continue to allow secondary housing units in single-family residential areas as provided by state law and Chapter 16 of the Mono County Land Development Regulations.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Mono County revised and streamlined Chapter 16, Secondary Housing, of the Land Development Regulations to clarify that second units are permitted in any land use designation that allows single family residences as a permitted use or as allowed in Specific Plan areas subject to general provisions listed in Chapter 16.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 4 The County shall not impose requirements for housing construction that increase housing costs other than those mandated by state law or those determined necessary to protect the health, welfare and safety of the residents of the County.

Responsible Agencies: Public Works Department, Environmental Health Department, Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Mono County has chosen not to raise fees in response to the current economic conditions.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 5 Maintain an up-to-date database of federal and state housing-related programs and funding opportunities.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Mono County has utilized HCD and CDBG information on housing-related programs and funding opportunities.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program will be strengthened by providing links on appropriate areas of the County's website to housing-related programs and funding opportunities. The Mono County Housing Authority will become the responsible agency for program implementation.**

Program 6 Encourage local nonprofit (Mammoth Lakes Housing Inc, Eastern Sierra Land Trust, etc.) and social service agencies such as the Inyo-Mono Area Agency on Aging (IMAAA) and the Inyo-Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA) to participate in and coordinate housing programs, such as "share a house," that are designed to ease the burden of housing costs for residents, including seniors and disabled.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, IMAAA, IMACA.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Various social service agencies in the area, including Mono County Social Services, IMAAA, and IMACA, do coordinate their activities to assist various target groups with housing needs. Mono County currently provides firsttime homebuyers funds to qualified applicants through a program administered by Mammoth Lakes Housing, Inc. (MLH). Mammoth Lakes Housing also administers workforce housing in Mammoth Lakes, both to rent and own.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Ongoing.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: The Mono County Housing Authority will become the responsible agency for program implementation. Program will be rewritten to reflect progress and clarify ongoing efforts.**

Program 7 During the permit review process, encourage housing designs and site plans that capitalize on solar heating and cooling advantages to reduce utility costs.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Mono County has encouraged applicants to implement passive and active solar designs into their projects, on a small scale for individual houses in various areas and on a larger scale for housing developments, such as Rock Creek Ranch, currently in the development process.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Ongoing.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: No adjustments are proposed.**

Program 8 Consider allowing an increase in density for those projects built for rental purposes in exchange for an agreement to retain rental units at an affordable price in perpetuity.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.



**PROGRESS: This program has not been addressed.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: -----**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program will continue. No adjustments are proposed.**

Program 9 Development projects and building permits shall comply with the Mono County Housing Mitigation Ordinance, which requires development projects to include affordable housing. The continued affordability of these units shall be assured through enforceable documents/deed restrictions that flow with the sale or ownership transference of the property. Smaller projects shall contribute their fair share via in-lieu housing mitigation fees or other comparable mechanisms. When the results of the County Fee Impact Study are adopted, this program shall be amended to reflect the results of that study.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This program has been implemented in a number of development project that have occurred, including Mountain Vistas, White Mountain Estates, Osage Circle, and Rock Creek Ranch. The Fee Impact Study has been completed and adopted; applicable requirements for affordable housing were incorporated into the Housing Ordinance.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program will continue. Program 10 below will be combined with this program to streamline the document. The final sentence pertaining to the Fee Impact Study will be deleted.**

Program 10 The majority of housing units required by Program 9 must be appropriate for families; i.e., not dormitory-style units, and must be reserved for families/households employed in the local economy.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This program has been implemented in a number of development project that have occurred, including Mountain Vistas, White Mountain Estates, Osage Circle, and Rock Creek Ranch.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program will continue and will be combined with this Program 9 to streamline the document**

Program 11 Implement housing impact fees and other applicable mitigation strategies based on recommendations from fee impact studies that document the fair share impact of new development on the limited housing supply. Coordinate regional housing mitigation and fee impact programs with those of the Town of Mammoth Lakes. (Note: Mono County is presently conducting a Fee Impact Study.)

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: 2004-2005.

**PROGRESS: The County has adopted a Housing Mitigation Ordinance and conducts annual reviews and updates of that ordinance. The County also completed a fee impact study, the results of which were incorporated into the Housing Ordinance. The County coordinates its housing mitigation and fee impact programs with the Town of Mammoth Lakes.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Implementation of housing impact fees will continue.**

Program 12 Through collaboration with a regional housing authority or similar entity, develop a range of affordable housing programs that address rental units, home ownership and alternative approaches to affordable housing, such as:

- a threshold fund that provides zero interest security deposit loans for tenants;
- apartments for fixed-income seniors;
- a community land trust used to acquire land for housing;
- sweat-equity programs that enable first-time buyers to contribute their time/labor toward the purchase of a home;
- co-housing for income qualified buyers;
- deed restrictions;
- energy efficient designs; and
- "share a house" programs designed to ease the burden of housing costs for residents, including seniors and disabled.

Responsible Agencies: Mono County, future housing authority, Eastern Sierra Land Trust, Council of Governments.

Timeframe: Ongoing once Housing Authority is established.

**PROGRESS: Mono County has established a Housing Authority. The County's Housing Mitigation Ordinance promotes a range of alternatives to affordable housing, including many of those mentioned above. However, that ordinance has not been in place long enough for much to have been implemented yet.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: The Mono County Housing Authority will become the responsible agency for implementing this program.**

Program 13 The County will meet with developers and encourage the development of housing for low- and moderate-income households. The County will maintain an inventory of suitable sites, conduct preapplication meetings to facilitate development, provide technical assistance, support appropriate funding applications and offer regulatory incentives and concessions to contribute to the feasibility of development of housing for lower-income households.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.



Timeframe: Ongoing.

**PROGRESS: The County continues to implement the activities mentioned in this program.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: -----**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program will continue. No adjustments are proposed.**

## **PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS**

Program 1 Review and consider revising development standards to provide for greater regulatory flexibility that promotes resident housing development opportunities. Issues and standards to review include, but are not limited to:

- parking requirements, particularly in June Lake and older central business districts;
- snow storage requirements;
- setbacks, including space between buildings;
- allowing smaller minimum lot sizes where appropriate for affordability;
- simplifying the permit process for cluster developments;
- broader application of the County's Manufactured Housing Subdivision provisions, which allows for lots as small as 4,000 square feet; and
- establishing performance criteria as a substitute for some existing inflexible regulations for residential development.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Regional Planning Advisory Committees, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: 2004.

**PROGRESS: During the previous planning period, the County amended setback requirements and simplified the permit process for cluster developments. Various community groups have considered parking requirements and County staff have considered smaller minimum lot sizes for affordability.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Some development standards have been amended to provide for greater flexibility. The County continues to consider other regulatory changes to promote increased residential development, particularly for lower income groups.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program will remain ongoing through 2014. The program will be amended to reflect changes in the standards that have occurred and to indicate that consideration of revising standards will be an ongoing process.**

Program 2 Consider revising Chapter 16, Development Standards – Secondary Housing, of the Land Development Regulations, to clarify the permitting and use of secondary housing units. Clarify occupancy requirements, their use as rental units, and methods to ensure the continued affordability of those units.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Regional Planning Advisory Committees.

Timeframe: 2004.

**PROGRESS: Mono County revised and streamlined Chapter 16, Secondary Housing, of the Land Development Regulations to clarify that second units are permitted in any land use designation that allows single family residences as a permitted use or as allowed in Specific Plan areas subject to general provisions listed in Chapter 16.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program is completed and will be removed from the revised element.**

Program 3 Consider revising the Land Development Regulations to clarify the use of manufactured housing, including requirements in non-residential land use designations, minimum standards for farm labor housing use, and the ability to propose manufactured housing subdivisions within additional land use designations.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Regional Planning Advisory Committees.

Timeframe: 2004.

**PROGRESS: The County has revised the Land Development Regulations to eliminate restrictions on singlewide mobilehomes.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program will remain ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 4 Revise the County's Subdivision Ordinance to provide greater flexibility in the division of land for a variety of housing types and to ensure consistency with the General Plan.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Regional Planning Advisory Committees.

Timeframe: 2004-2005.

**PROGRESS: The County is currently in the process of revising its subdivision ordinance.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Unknown**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing. The program will be amended to clarify how amending the subdivision ordinance can benefit the development of housing in the County.**

Program 5 Conduct preapplication conferences with project proponents to assist them in understanding permit procedures and to resolve potential application difficulties early in the review process.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Land Development Technical Advisory Committee (LDTAC) = Planning Division,

Building Division, Public Works Department, Environmental Health, and Compliance Division.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Ongoing.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 6 Review permit-processing procedures to ensure streamlining of the permit process. Review and revise application packets, as needed, to ensure that they are comprehensive, clear and easy to use.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: The County periodically reviews its permit processing and application materials to ensure that they are streamlined and easy to use. The County is currently in the process of switching to electronic permit processing in order to better integrate the departments involved in permitting.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 7 The County will establish a formal policy and procedure to provide reasonable accommodation for exception requests to building codes, permit processes, land use controls, zoning and fees for the development, maintenance, and improvement of housing for persons with disabilities.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2004-2005.

**PROGRESS: The County has an extremely small number of applications involving persons with disabilities. Currently, these cases are handled through the normal permitting process that provides reasonable accommodation for variances related to improvements for persons with disabilities. This has proven to be effective.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: -----**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**

## **CONSERVATION AND REHABILITATION**

Program 1 Continue to implement General Plan policies concerning the use of alternative energy sources (active and passive solar, etc.) in the development, rehabilitation, and replacement of housing units, including enforcement of Title 24 of the California Energy Commission Regulations.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department/Building Division.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Ongoing.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. The County will begin to implement green codes in August 2009.**

Program 2 Support the continuation of home weatherization programs offered by state agencies, utility companies and other groups.

Responsible Agencies: Economic Development and Special Projects Department in cooperation with IMACA, Southern California Edison, Sierra Pacific Power, and the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Ongoing. The High Sierra Energy Foundation, a non-profit corporation supported by local individuals, businesses, and the Town of Mammoth Lakes, provides information on renewable energy, as well as energy efficiency for consumers in the High Sierra.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. Program will be strengthened by providing links on appropriate areas of the County's website to information on home weatherization and to the High Sierra Energy Foundation website. The Mono County Housing Authority will become the responsible agency in cooperation with local social service agencies and utilities.**

Program 3 Make information available to homeowners and renters regarding weatherization and other programs that may assist in maintaining the affordability of housing units.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Ongoing. The High Sierra Energy Foundation, a non-profit corporation supported by local individuals, businesses, and the Town of Mammoth Lakes, provides information on renewable energy, as well as energy efficiency for consumers in the High Sierra.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. Program will be strengthened by providing links on appropriate areas of the County's website to information on home weatherization and to the High Sierra Energy Foundation website. The Mono County Housing Authority will become the responsible agency.**

Program 4 Periodically update the housing conditions survey to identify areas in Mono County that would benefit from rehabilitation.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: June 2004.

**PROGRESS: A comprehensive housing conditions survey is currently being conducted and will be completed by July 2009.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: In process.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Results from the current survey will be mapped on the County's GIS system. Housing conditions survey will be updated one year prior to required Housing Element Update, in order to provide most up-to-**

**date information for the Housing Element. The Mono County Housing Authority will become the responsible agency, along with the Building Division of the Community Development Department.**

Program 5 Continue to participate in the state's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program for rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing units. The County's goal is to rehabilitate 40 units during the planning period. The County will apply annually for CDBG funds.

Responsible Agencies: Economic Development and Special Projects Department, Community Development Department, IMACA.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: This has not occurred due to lack of current housing conditions information and lack of available staff time.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: ----**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Implementation of this program will become the responsibility of the Mono County Housing Authority. Following completion of the housing conditions survey, the County will determine the need for rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing units and will develop a quantified objective for this program.**

Program 6 Provide community education regarding the availability of rehabilitation programs and provide public outreach regarding the availability of rehabilitation programs to low- and very low-income households and other special needs groups in areas identified as needing rehabilitation.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, IMACA.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Ongoing.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Unknown. Following completion of the current housing conditions survey, the County will target areas for community education concerning rehabilitation programs.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. Implementation of this program will become the responsibility of the Mono County Housing Authority. Program will be strengthened by providing links on appropriate areas of the County's website to information on rehabilitation loans. Areas identified as needing rehabilitation by the housing conditions survey will be targeted with public outreach concerning rehabilitation programs.**

Program 7 Assist applicants in accessing home rehabilitation loans.

Responsible Agencies: Economic Development and Special Projects Department, Community Development Department, IMACA.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Ongoing. None applied for during prior planning period.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Unknown.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. Implementation of this program will become the responsibility of the Mono County Housing Authority.**

Program 8 Encourage the private rehabilitation of housing, particularly rental housing, by establishing a tax code enforcement program.<sup>2</sup>

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, IMACA.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Not completed.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: -----**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. Program will be amended to allow for the consideration of methods to encourage the private rehabilitation of housing, particularly rental housing. Implementation of this program will become the responsibility of the Mono County Housing Authority.**

Program 9 Develop an active rental inspection program to ensure rental housing maintenance. This may require a fee to support inspection services. Careful consideration should be given to the fee structure to avoid increasing the costs of rental housing. Also consider a "self-certification program" for landlords who participate in a maintenance/management training program. Apply for and utilize CDBG funds to ensure affordability will not be affected by maintenance activities.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2008.

**PROGRESS: Not completed. The County does not have a database of rental units.**

**Due to the unique nature of housing in the County, with substantial numbers of second homes, the rental market is not limited to multi-family units.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: -----**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. Program will be amended to focus on units that are identified as needing maintenance or rehabilitation in the current housing conditions survey. Implementation of this program will be the responsibility of the Mono County Housing Authority and the Code Enforcement Division of the Community Development Department.**

Program 10 Encourage the private rehabilitation of housing through enforcement of the property maintenance provisions of the Uniform Housing Code and the Uniform Code for the Abatement of Hazardous Buildings. Also, consider adopting the Uniform Code for Building Conservation as a building conservation guideline.

---

<sup>2</sup>Complaints of substandard housing should be referred to the Building Division, which will then notify the state. California Revenue and Taxation Code Section 17299 denies deductions to owners of substandard rental property; denying the deductions for interest, taxes and depreciation is an effective tool for upgrading rental units.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Ongoing. The County currently enforces the 2006 International Property Maintenance Code. The Code Enforcement Division identifies and addresses property maintenance issues throughout the County.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 11 Encourage the rehabilitation of existing units over their demolition where practical through such measures as:

- Providing flexibility in administering building code requirements to facilitate the repair, remodel and refurbishment of existing units instead of their demolition;
- Developing a user-friendly process for repair, remodel and refurbishment, including handouts;
- Providing courtesy walk-through field assistance for owners seeking help in determining if demolition is necessary;
- Considering fee reductions and fast-track permit review for qualifying remodels; and
- Conducting outreach to communities and development interests regarding programs available for repair, remodel and refurbishment.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Ongoing. County is currently implementing these measures.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**

## EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES

Program 1 Disseminate and maintain fair housing information and education materials throughout the County and ensure public awareness of fair housing laws and processes. Materials will be distributed in a variety of public locations including government centers, libraries, post offices, and shopping areas.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Social Services.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Ongoing.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. Program will be strengthened by providing links on appropriate areas of the County's website to sources of fair housing information. The Mono County Housing Authority will become the responsible agency for program implementation.**



Program 2 Refer persons with complaints of housing discrimination to appropriate agencies such as IMACA, the Department of Social Services, or the district office of the Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

Responsible Agencies: IMACA, Social Services.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: Ongoing.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014.**

**Program will be strengthened by providing links on appropriate areas of the County's website to agencies that deal with housing discrimination. The Mono County Housing Authority will become the responsible agency for program implementation.**

## **PRESERVING UNITS AT RISK OF CONVERSION TO MARKET RATE USES**

Program 1 Legally restrict units intended for low-income and/or employee housing uses to those uses.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: The County adopted a Housing Mitigation Ordinance (Chapter 15.40, Mono County Code) in 2006, which requires new development to mitigate impacts to housing through the development of affordable housing units, the payment of fees, or similar means. Since adoption of the ordinance, the County has approved several subdivisions with designated affordable housing units and has required those units be legally restricted as low-income or employee housing units.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Successful. Requirements are in place and have been implemented.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 2 Continue to enforce regulations in the Mono County General Plan concerning the conversion of residential facilities or mobile-home spaces in a mobile-home park to other uses.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS: The County has adjusted its regulations concerning the conversion of residential units in a mobilehome park to better align with state regulations. No conversions of such uses have been proposed.**

**EFFECTIVENESS: Regulations are consistent with state regulations.**

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM: Program remains ongoing through 2014. No adjustments proposed.**

Program 3 Provide incentives for property owners to participate in state or federally funded rental assistance or subsidy programs. These incentives may include fee reductions, administrative (grant) assistance, and streamlined permit processing for rehabilitations.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2001-2008.

**PROGRESS:** The Owens Valley Indian Authority owns and operates Camp Antelope in Mono County's Antelope Valley, a housing development intended for Native Americans. When they applied for federal funding to rehabilitate the housing at Camp Antelope, the County streamlined the associated permit processing.

**EFFECTIVENESS:** Successful.

**ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAM:** Program remains ongoing through 2014. Program will be strengthened by including information on the County's website about permit streamlining for projects involving state or federally funded rental assistance or subsidy programs. The County will also consider fee reductions for this type of project.

## V. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

---

### SUMMARY OVERVIEW

Housing element law essentially consists of two main components guiding the preparation of the Housing Element: analysis of housing needs, resources and constraints, etc. (Government Code Section 65583(a) and housing programs (Government Code Section 655/83(c)). A meaningful housing element strongly reflects a community's needs by drawing a tight connection between the analysis of housing needs and the development of housing programs to address those needs.

This section summarizes housing needs, resources and constraints for the unincorporated area of Mono County and develops priorities for program actions and strategies.

### Population Characteristics

- **Population Growth**

Population growth in the unincorporated areas of Mono County was rapid from 1980 until 2000, when it slowed considerably. In recent years, the growth rate in the unincorporated area has increased again, due primarily to a need for housing for residents working in Mammoth Lakes (see Table 2). Population growth in the unincorporated areas is anticipated to continue, due to the continuing need for low- to moderate-income housing for workers and professionals employed in the County and the high cost of living in the Town of Mammoth Lakes.

Population growth is anticipated to continue in the Long Valley and Wheeler Crest areas due to the resort growth in Mammoth Lakes and the associated need for low- to moderate-income housing. Population growth may also occur in the Tri-Valley area due to increased housing pressure from the Bishop area and the anticipated availability of newly subdivided lands.

- **Ethnicity**

The population in the unincorporated area of Mono County remains predominantly white (85.4 percent of the population), with 4.8 percent American Indian and the remainder other races.

The percentage of the population identifying themselves as Hispanic or Latino, of whatever race, rose slightly between 1990 and 2000. This population is fairly evenly distributed throughout the County's communities. Anecdotal data indicates that the Hispanic population is employed throughout the County in service jobs and has continued to increase since the 2000 census.

During this same period, the Hispanic/Latino population in Mammoth Lakes increased from 14.5 percent of the town's population in 1990 to 22.2 percent of the

town's population in 2000, an increase of 881 persons. The State Department of Finance is projecting that the Hispanic population in the County will rise dramatically over the next twenty years, to 43 percent of the total County population in 2020 and 57 percent of the total in 2030. The rise in the Hispanic population could impact housing in the unincorporated area, as many of the Hispanic population tend to be lower paid service workers in need of low- to moderate-income housing.

- **Age**

The median age in the unincorporated area increased from 33 in 1990 to 40.1 in 2000. Sixty-five percent of the unincorporated population is in the 18-64 age group. The number of children under age 5 decreased while the number of seniors 65 years and older increased.

Antelope Valley had the highest percentage of children under age 5, most of them west of U.S. 395, probably in the Marine Corps housing in Coleville. Antelope Valley also had the highest percentage of seniors 65 years and older. The Long Valley/Wheeler Crest and Tri-Valley planning areas also had high percentages of children under age 5 and seniors 65 years and older.

The State Department of Finance is projecting that the population in the County will age over the next twenty years, with the percent of the total County population that is elderly (65 years and over) rising from 11.6 percent in 2010 to 17.5 percent of the total in 2030 (see Table 9). The percentage of those 19 and under will rise slightly, while those aged 20-64 will decline from 65 percent of the total population in 2010 to 54.8 percent in 2030.

### **KEY FINDINGS – Population**

- Population in the unincorporated area is continuing to grow but at a slower rate than in the past.
- Population pressures are strong in Long Valley/Wheeler Crest and Tri-Valley (particularly Chalfant). Much of the population pressure is a result of continued resort growth in Mammoth Lakes and the associated need for low- to moderate-income housing.
- The Hispanic population is growing throughout the County.
- The population in the unincorporated area is aging.

## **Household Characteristics**

- **Household Growth**

The number of households in unincorporated Mono County continues to increase. Between 1990 and 2000, the greatest increase in households occurred in the Long Valley/Wheeler Crest area and the Antelope Valley.

Average household size for the unincorporated area in Mono County decreased slightly from 2.51 in 1990 to 2.40 in 2000. Antelope Valley west of U.S. 395 and the Tri-Valley had the highest average household sizes; Bridgeport Valley and Antelope Valley east of U.S. 395 had the lowest average household sizes.

- **Household Tenure**

The overall number of renters in the unincorporated area decreased from 40 percent of all households in 1990 to 31 percent of all households in 2000. Between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of households that were renters remained fairly constant in Antelope Valley and June Lake, decreased slightly in Bridgeport Valley and Tri-Valley, and decreased significantly in Mono Basin and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest.

Between 1990 and 2000, the number of renters in single-family residences in the unincorporated area decreased while the number in multiple-family residences and mobile homes increased.

- **Occupancy**

Mono County has a high vacancy rate (39 percent in 2000) due to the large number of vacation homes and seasonal use units in the area. In 2000, the vacancy rate for rentals was 3 percent, while the vacancy rate for units for sale was 6 percent. Eighty-four percent of the vacant units were seasonal or recreational use units.

When the census was taken in 2000, only Antelope Valley, Long Valley/Wheeler Crest, and Tri-Valley had units available for rent. All of the planning areas except Mono Basin had units available for sale, with the most units available in June Lake and Tri-Valley. Mono Basin and June Lake had the highest percentages of vacant units reserved for seasonal use, while Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley had the lowest percentages of vacant units reserved for seasonal use.

- **Overcrowding**

An overcrowded household is a housing unit occupied by more than one person per room (not including kitchens and bathrooms). Units with more than 1.51 persons per room are considered severely overcrowded and indicate a significant housing need.

Overcrowding is not a significant housing situation in unincorporated Mono County. In 2000, there were a total of 125 overcrowded households. Of those 125 households, 32 percent were renters, approximately the same percentage as the overall rate for renters in the unincorporated area. Less than 3 percent of all households in the unincorporated area were severely overcrowded in 2000. Of the 67 households identified as being severely overcrowded, 57 were owner households and only 10 were renter households.

- **Extremely Low Income (ELI) Households**

Data on the number of extremely-low income households in the County are available through HUD's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), which

utilizes census data from 2000. According to CHAS data, in 2000, there were approximately 229 extremely-low income households in the unincorporated area, 7.5 percent of the total number of households. Fifty-one percent of the extremely-low income households were renters; 41 percent were homeowners. The households renting comprised a variety of household types, elderly, small and large related households, and small and large non-related households. The homeowners were predominantly elderly (74 percent of extremely-low income homeowners), with the remaining 26 percent being households with 2-4 relatives.

- **Overpayment**

Households are considered to be overpaying for housing if payments for rent or mortgage are 30 percent or more of household income. The number of lower-income households (those at or below 80 percent of the median income) overpaying is of special concern. In 1999, the median household income for unincorporated Mono County was \$45,325. Eighty percent of the median household income is \$36,260; the closest category available in the census data is \$35,000.

In 2000, there were approximately 505 households (22% of all households) in the unincorporated area of Mono County paying 30 percent or more of their household income for housing. Twenty-eight (28) percent of all renter-occupied households were overpaying; 19 percent of all owner-occupied households were overpaying. Of the 585 households reporting a household income less than \$35,000, 305 (44 percent of households with income less than \$35,000 or 13 percent of all households) were overpaying, including all renter-occupied households with income less than \$35,000.

June Lake and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest had the highest percentages of households overpaying. In both planning areas, there were a substantial number of homeowners with incomes greater than \$35,000 who were overpaying.

Affordable housing for low- and moderate-income households has been identified as the single most important housing issue throughout the County. Since the 2000 U.S. Census, housing prices have continued to rise in the County, particularly in Mammoth Lakes, increasing housing pressures on surrounding communities in the County.

- **Disabled Persons**

The disabled population in Mono County is not a significant portion of the total population. Several social service agencies in the area provide services to the disabled population; i.e., the Inyo Mono Association for the Handicapped (IMAH), the Inyo Mono Area Agency on Aging (IMAAA), Kern Regional Center, the Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA), and the Mono County Department of Social Services. Due to the large size of their service areas and the relatively small numbers of clients, their services are prescriptive in nature and needs are addressed on an individual basis. There is no need in the unincorporated area for group housing for disabled persons at this time.

- **Seniors**

There were 436 senior households (65 years and older) in unincorporated Mono County in 2000, 18.8 percent of all households. Of the 436 senior households, only 19 were renters, indicating a home ownership rate of 95.7 for seniors. In addition, only 18 seniors had incomes under the poverty level in 1999.

- **Large Households**

Large households are defined as households with more than five persons. Overcrowding is not a significant housing situation in the unincorporated area of Mono County, with only 7.8 percent of all households identified as overcrowded. Of the 180 households identified as overcrowded, 78 households (43 percent of all overcrowded households) are occupied by renters.

Large households (5 or more persons) are located throughout the County but predominantly in Antelope Valley, Long Valley and Tri-Valley. These areas have large numbers of children and teenagers. There are no renter-occupied large households except in Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley. Forty-six of the 52 renter-occupied households in Antelope Valley are located west of U.S. 395, probably in the Marine Corps housing at Coleville.

- **Farmworker Housing**

While the acreage in farms in Mono County declined between 1997 and 2007, from 68,813 acres to 44,610 acres, the number of farms increased from 63 to 84. The average size of farms decreased from 1,092 acres to 531 acres; hired farm labor decreased from 121 farmworkers on 26 farms to an undisclosed number of workers on 22 farms.

Large farm owners and ranchers in the Antelope, Bridgeport and Hammil valleys hire a limited number of farmworkers and ranch hands. Housing for most of these employees is provided on site.

- **Female-Headed Households**

In unincorporated Mono County, there were 137 female-headed households in 2000, down from 144 in 1990. Of the 137 female-headed households, 33 were under the poverty level, down from 46 in 1990. The 33 female-headed households under the poverty represent 49.2 percent of all households under the poverty level.

Antelope Valley and June Lake have the highest numbers of female-headed households, as well as the highest number of female-headed households under the poverty level. Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley have the highest numbers of total families under the poverty level.

The Mono County Department of Social Services estimates that approximately 45 families in the unincorporated area with a female head of household receive assistance from CalWorks on an ongoing basis. Under this program they are eligible



to receive food stamps and Medi-Cal, as well as Welfare to Work services including, but not limited to, mental health, drug and alcohol counseling, child care, and job skills. There are no direct housing assistance programs.

- **Emergency Housing**

Mono County does not have a large homeless population, largely due to the severe winter weather conditions. The Mono County Department of Social Services estimates that it has approximately one homeless assistance case per year, usually a family displaced for a short time each year. The Mono County Department of Social Services and the Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action (IMACA) provide rental assistance and shelter for homeless persons.

Mono County does not have any homeless shelters, due to the low numbers of homeless persons. In addition, the social services that are provided are not concentrated in one location, making it difficult for a homeless person to utilize them, especially since there is only limited public transportation within the County and the town of Mammoth Lakes. Current services are adequate for the needs in the area.

## **KEY FINDINGS – Households**

- The number of households in the unincorporated area is continuing to grow as the population grows.
- The number of renters is decreasing.
- Average household size remains approximately the same.
- The unincorporated area continues to have a high vacancy rate due to the large number of seasonal use units throughout the County.
- Overcrowding is not an issue in Mono County.
- Overpayment occurs in Mono County, including many renters. Some households overpaying have moderate-level incomes.
- Affordable housing for low- and moderate-income households has been identified as the single most important housing issue throughout the County. Since the 2000 U.S. Census, housing prices have continued to rise in the County, particularly in Mammoth Lakes, increasing housing pressures on surrounding communities in the County.
- Housing needs for special population groups in Mono County are not a priority concern.

Disabled persons are not a significant portion of the population – their housing needs are addressed by regional social service agencies.

Seniors in Mono County are predominantly homeowners.

There are few large households and overcrowding is not a problem.

There are relatively few farmworkers and housing is generally provided for them.

The number of female-headed households is decreasing slightly, and many of them have incomes above the poverty level.



There are no permanent emergency shelters in Mono County and generally only one or two homeless assistance cases in the unincorporated area per year.

## Employment

- **Employment Trends**

Mono County's overall employment is dominated by leisure and hospitality services, retail trade and government industries. Industry projections from the California Employment Development Department for the Eastern Sierra Region estimate that job growth in the area between 2004 and 2014 will be strongest in Leisure and Hospitality Services, Government, Retail Trade, and Trade, Transportation and Utilities.

Employment trends for the unincorporated area vary from the County as a whole with higher percentages in agriculture, construction and mining (particularly mining), manufacturing, transportation and public utilities, and services, and lower percentages in wholesale trade, retail trade, finance, insurance, real estate and government.

- **Place of Work**

Many County residents do not work in the community in which they live. Approximately 25 percent (729 persons) of workers 16 and older residing in unincorporated Mono County worked outside the County and outside the state in 2000. Mono County workers who worked outside the state lived predominantly in Antelope Valley. The highest numbers of those who worked outside Mono County but in California lived in Long Valley/Wheeler Crest and Tri-Valley. Significant portions of June Lake and Mono Basin residents also worked outside Mono County. This indicates that there is a significant jobs/housing imbalance in Mono County.

Travel times to work are highest in Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley, reflecting the fact that many residents of those areas work outside the community. A large number of Long Valley/Wheeler Crest workers commute between 30 and 44 minutes, probably to Inyo County.

- **Income**

The overall median household income in the unincorporated area in 1999 was \$45,325. The median household income varied significantly, however, throughout the County depending on the area and the age of the householder, with the southern half of the County having generally higher overall income levels. The median income for Mono County in 2008 was \$65,900 (HCD, 2008 income limits).

Mono County residents in the unincorporated area had income from a variety of sources in 1999. Self-employment income was highest in June Lake and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest. Income from investments (interest, dividends, rentals) was highest in Long Valley/Wheeler Crest, June Lake and Mono Basin. Social Security income was highest in Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley. Supplemental Security income was highest in Antelope Valley and Tri-Valley, while Public Assistance income was highest in Mono Basin and June Lake. Income from retirement funds was highest in Tri-Valley and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest.

- **Poverty**

The total number of persons with income below poverty level in the unincorporated area decreased from 563 in 1989 to 438 in 1999. The number of persons with income below poverty level decreased for all age groups, except 18-64 years old, which increased from 282 to 292 persons, and in all planning areas, except June Lake, which increased from 30 to 39 persons and Long Valley/Wheeler, which increased from 19 to 38 persons.

The total number of families in the unincorporated area with an income below poverty level also decreased from 100 in 1989 to 67 in 1999. The number of families with an income below poverty level decreased for all family types, except for female-headed households with children, which increased from 8 families to 33, and in all planning areas except June Lake, which increased from 8 to 11 families, and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest, which increased from 25 to 36 families. The increases in June Lake and Long Valley/Wheeler Crest were primarily the result of increases in female-headed households with children with incomes below poverty level.

## **KEY FINDINGS – Employment**

- Mono County's overall employment continues to be dominated by leisure and hospitality services, retail trade and government.
- There is a significant jobs/housing imbalance in Mono County. Many residents in the unincorporated area work outside their communities, outside the County, or outside the state. Commute times are significant for large portions of the population.
- Major employment centers are located in Mammoth Lakes (services, retail trade, government), June Lake (seasonal services and retail trade) and Bridgeport (government). Despite the availability of Commercial (C) and Mixed Use (MU) zoning throughout communities in the unincorporated area, it is unlikely that sufficient jobs will develop to eliminate the need for workers to commute to jobs outside their communities.
- The overall median household income in the unincorporated area in 1999 was \$45,325. The median household income varied significantly, however, throughout the County depending on the area and the age of the householder, with the southern half of the County having generally higher overall income levels. The median income for Mono County in 2008 was \$65,900 (HCD, 2008 income limits).
- The total number of persons and families with income below poverty level decreased between 1989 and 1999.

## **Housing Characteristics**

- **Housing Types**

Housing in unincorporated Mono County is predominantly single-family detached units and mobile homes. Since 1990, all types of housing in the unincorporated area

increased except for single-family attached units and mobile homes. During that period, multifamily units had the greatest percentage increase, with an increase of 68.2 percent (120 units) in two- to four-unit developments from 1990-2000.

- **Housing Stock Conditions**

The Mono County Community Development Department is in the process of conducting a comprehensive Housing Condition Survey for the unincorporated area of the County. The survey will be completed in the summer of 2009. Appropriate sections of the Housing Element will be updated once the survey is complete. In general, Mono County's housing stock is in fair to good condition. Approximately 60 percent of all housing units in the unincorporated area have been built in the past 30 years. There are areas in the County, however, where maintenance and rehabilitation of the housing stock is an issue.

### **KEY FINDINGS – Housing Characteristics**

- Housing in the unincorporated area of Mono County is primarily single-family residences including mobile homes. Between 1990 and 2000, the number of multifamily units had the highest percentage increase of any type of housing.
- The Mono County Community Development Department is in the process of conducting a comprehensive Housing Condition Survey for the unincorporated area of the County. The survey will be completed in the summer of 2009. Once the survey is complete, the appropriate section of the Housing Element will be updated. In general, Mono County's housing stock is in fair to good condition. Approximately 60 percent of all housing units in the unincorporated area have been built in the past 30 years. There are areas in the County, however, where maintenance and rehabilitation of the housing stock is an issue.

## **Regional Housing Need**

- **Regional Housing Need**

The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) established Regional Housing Needs for the unincorporated area of Mono County for the planning period (2007-2014): 59 units for very low-income households, 59 units for low-income households, 58 units for moderate-income households, and 116 units for above moderate-income households.

### **KEY FINDINGS – Regional Housing Need**

- In contrast to the prior planning period for the housing element, housing starts have slowed dramatically in the County. During the prior planning period, the County experienced explosive growth in new residential construction, meeting much of the County's identified regional housing need by new construction. Over the past two years, housing starts have dropped from 27 units in 2007, to 13 units in 2008, to 4 units in the first half of 2009. The County has approved several large subdivisions during this period that would fulfill part of the regional needs

- for moderate to above moderate housing. Those subdivisions also have requirements for affordable housing units that would fulfill a portion of the requirement for very low and low housing
- Due to the slowing in housing starts, Mono County has made little progress in meeting the identified regional housing needs. The remaining housing need is 58 units for very low-income households, 47 units for low-income households, 45 units for moderate-income households, and 74 units for above moderate-income households.

## Land Use Inventory

- **Physical and Environmental Constraints**

There are areas within Mono County that are unavailable for residential development because of site constraints such as natural hazards or environmentally sensitive lands. The high cost of building on these lands, coupled with environmental constraints, in many cases would make them unsuitable for development. Development in the following areas may be prohibited by the County's General Plan and/or Land Development Regulations, by requirements of other state or federal agencies, may present a hazard to those who choose to build in the area, or may impact valuable resources and require costly mitigation measures: remote locations without reasonable access or available public services, hazard-prone areas (avalanche-prone areas, fault hazard zones, geologically sensitive areas, flood plains), areas with low permeability soils unsuitable for septic systems, and environmentally sensitive areas (wetlands, stream corridors, sensitive wildlife habitat, areas with endangered plant species).

- **Zoning for Lower Income**

Mono County has several land use designations that provide density bonuses for affordable housing and that are intended to provide for the efficient use of land and to increase opportunities for affordable housing. The following land use designations promote the provision of affordable housing: Multi-Family Residential-Low, Moderate, High (MFR-L, M, H); Mixed Use (MU); and Commercial Lodging-Moderate, High (CL-M, H).

- **Infrastructure Availability**

Much of the land available for residential development in the unincorporated area requires individual septic systems and wells. Some areas of the County have small community water systems but still require individual septic systems; other areas have community sewer systems but require individual wells.

Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) water quality regulations affect the minimum lot size on which development can occur depending on whether community water and/or sewer systems are available. If community water is available, but individual septic systems are required, the minimum lot size required by RWQCB is 20,000 square feet. If both individual wells and septic systems are required the minimum lot size is 40,000 square feet.

In some areas in the County where individual lots are 7,500 square feet, these requirements make it necessary to have more than one lot to build a house. Some areas of the County also have soils that are not conducive to standard septic system designs. Those areas may require additional septic system improvements that increase the cost of building.

- **Redevelopable Sites**

Mono County has sufficient undeveloped sites available to meet its identified regional housing needs. There is no need to include redevelopable sites as part of this analysis.

- **Sites & Zoning that Facilitate Housing for Farmworkers & Homeless**

The Agriculture (AG) designation allows farm labor housing without any type of development permit, other than a building permit. The Scenic Area Agriculture (SAA) designation also allows farm labor housing without any type of development permit, other than a building permit, to the extent the development complies with the **Mono Basin National Forest Scenic Area Private Property Development Guidelines** and with the **Compatibility Determinations for Proposed New Commercial Uses and Developments**. There are many acres of agriculturally zoned land in Antelope Valley, Bridgeport Valley, and Tri Valley.

The Mono County Land Development Regulations do not specifically address housing for homeless since there is not a significant homeless population in the County. Zoning designations that allow for multiple-family residential units; i.e., Multiple-Family Residential (MFR-L, M, H), Mixed Use (MU), and Commercial Lodging (CL-L, H) would also provide for homeless housing if it becomes necessary.

- **Realistic Capacity**

Mono County's Land Use Element, in Chapter V, Projected Buildout, discusses land available for development by zoning district and the realistic buildout figures for that land. Tables 2 and 3 of the Land Use Element show projected buildout figures for each community area and for the private lands outside community areas. These tables note where maximum densities are not realistic based on environmental constraints, lack of infrastructure, lack of access, and/or community desire to keep large parcels of agricultural land as open space. Realistic capacity is also addressed in Appendix B for specific income groups.

## **KEY FINDINGS – Land Use Inventory**

- There are areas within Mono County that are unavailable for residential development because of site constraints such as natural hazards or environmentally sensitive lands. The high cost of building on these lands, coupled with environmental constraints, in many cases would make them unsuitable for development.

- Mono County has several land use designations that provide density bonuses for affordable housing and that are intended to provide for the efficient use of land and to increase opportunities for affordable housing.
- Water and sewer systems are available in some communities. If individual septic systems are required, the minimum lot size required is 20,000 square feet. If individual wells and septic systems are required, the minimum lot size is 40,000 square feet. In some areas of the County, these requirements make it necessary to have more than one lot to build a house.
- Mono County has sufficient undeveloped sites available to meet its identified regional housing needs. There is no need to include redevelopable sites as part of this analysis.
- Mono County's Land Development Regulations allow farm housing and multifamily residential units, such as homeless housing, in several land use designations. There are many acres of agriculturally zoned land in the County. There are not significant homeless or farm workers population in the County, however, so those types of housing are not a high priority.
- Maximum densities are not realistic in some areas based on environmental constraints, lack of infrastructure, lack of access, and/or community desire to keep large parcels of agricultural land as open space. These areas are generally outside of established communities. Within many communities, maximum densities are realistic due to lack of environmental constraints, adequate services and access, and higher density designations.

## **Governmental Constraints**

- **Land Use Controls**

Mono County's Land Use Designations and Land Development Regulations, which are integrated into the Mono County Land Use Element, provide for residential development throughout the unincorporated portion of the County. The County's Land Use Element, including the Land Development Regulations, does not contain any growth-control measures. Development standards, including permitted uses, lot size, lot dimensions, lot coverage, setbacks, density, building heights, and parking requirements have remained consistent since the early 1990s and have not been identified as constraints to development. Although Mono County's land development regulations and development standards have not been identified as constraints to development, there may be opportunities to increase the flexibility of those regulations in order to increase housing opportunities countywide.

- **Requirements Imposed by Other Agencies**

A number of other agencies (e.g., Southern California Edison, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish and Game) impose land use controls that affect development in Mono County. These regulations may constrain development by affecting the location and/or cost of development.



- **Codes and Enforcement**

The Mono County Building Division enforces current building, plumbing, mechanical, electric and energy codes. Development must also comply with seismic, wind, soils, energy conservation, and sound transmission control standards, which have been established on a countywide basis. Building Code requirements are generally state standards and do not create a constraint to the development of housing.

The County has an ongoing code compliance program to ensure compliance with the County Code, including the Mono County Land Development Regulations, and the codes enforced by the Building Division. It does not create a constraint to development.

- **On-/Off-Site Improvement Standards**

On-site improvements for residential construction are generally limited to improvements required by the County's Fire Safe Regulations, and septic and water improvements required by the County Health Department or by local sewer and water providers. These required improvements are based on state requirements and do not create an additional constraint to development. Local fire departments may also require additional on-site improvements. Off-site development requirements for residential construction are generally limited to collection of school district fees and fire protection mitigation fees in areas within fire protection districts.

On-site improvements for subdivisions and land divisions may include the above requirements as well as additional requirements depending on the size and type of the proposed subdivision. Due to the environmental sensitivity of much of the land in the County, additional development requirements may be imposed through the environmental review process on discretionary projects (this does not apply to the construction of a single-family residence by an individual). Additional development requirements to mitigate significant environmental impacts from a proposed project may increase the overall cost of the project that in turn may increase the cost of housing within the project.

- **Fees and Exactions**

Mono County collects development fees and building permit fees to cover the actual cost of services rendered. While they increase the cost of housing, they are not a constraint to development. The County streamlined its permit processing in order to expedite the development process and minimize the fees involved in a project and is now in the process of switching to electronic permit processing in order to streamline the process further. The County may also require the following land dedications and exactions, depending on the location and type of the development: street rights of way, public utility easements, open space and trail dedications, snow storage easements, employee housing.



Total fees for a typical single-family and multifamily development will vary depending on where in the County the project is located. Typical fees for a multifamily residential unit will be approximately 75 percent of the cost for a single-family residential unit.

The County completed a fee impact study and adopted a Housing Mitigation Ordinance in order to implement in-lieu fees and/or land dedications to provide for affordable housing.

## **KEY FINDINGS – Governmental Constraints**

- Although Mono County's land development regulations and development standards have not been identified as constraints to development, there may be opportunities to increase the flexibility of those regulations in order to increase housing opportunities Countywide.
- A number of other agencies impose land use controls that may constrain development in Mono County by affecting the location and/or cost of development.
- The Mono County Building Division enforces a variety of building standards established on a countywide basis. Building Code requirements are generally state standards and do not create a constraint to the development of housing. The County has an ongoing code compliance program to ensure compliance with the County Code, including the Mono County Land Development Regulations, and the codes enforced by the Building Division. It does not create a constraint to development.
- On-site improvements for residential construction are generally limited to improvements required by the County's Fire Safe Regulations, and septic and water improvements required by the County Health Department or by local sewer and water providers. These required improvements are based on state requirements and do not create an additional constraint to development. Local fire departments may also require additional on-site improvements. Off-site development requirements for residential construction are generally limited to collection of school district fees and fire protection mitigation fees in areas within fire protection districts.
- On-site improvements for subdivisions and land divisions may include the above requirements as well as additional requirements depending on the size and type of the proposed subdivision. Due to the environmental sensitivity of much of the land in the County, additional development requirements may be imposed through the environmental review process on discretionary projects (this does not apply to the construction of a single-family residence by an individual). Additional development requirements to mitigate significant environmental impacts from a proposed project may increase the overall cost of the project that in turn may increase the cost of housing within the project.
- Mono County collects development fees and building permit fees to cover the actual cost of services rendered. While they increase the cost of housing, they are

not a constraint to development. The County streamlined its permit processing in order to expedite the development process and minimize the fees involved in a project and is now in the process of switching to an electronic permit processing system. The County may also require the land dedications and exactions, depending on the location and type of the development.

- The County completed a fee impact study and adopted a Housing Mitigation Ordinance in order to implement in-lieu fees and/or land dedications to provide for affordable housing.

## **Non-Governmental Constraints**

- **Land Costs**

Land costs vary significantly depending where a parcel is located, whether community utilities are available to the site, whether infrastructure (access roads, utility lines) are installed on site, on the type of parcel (small town lot, large agricultural parcel), and on the housing demand in the area. No one area has overall lower or higher land costs; it depends on the parcel in question.

- **Construction Costs**

Construction costs are estimated to range from \$150-\$250 per square foot for single-family residential construction in the unincorporated area of Mono County. These costs include land, fees, materials, labor and financing. Due to the wide range of land costs, fees and development requirements throughout the County, it is very difficult to estimate a "typical" total development cost for single-family residential development.

- **Availability of Financing**

Financing for home construction or purchase is now generally available to Mono County residents at competitive rates. Lower interest rates are making it feasible for households with more moderate incomes to construct or purchase homes.

There are a number of government-assisted loan programs to enable low- and moderate-income households to construct or purchase housing. These programs are generally available to Mono County residents.

- **Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate Uses**

Mono County does not have any multifamily rental housing that could be converted to market-rate rents.

- **Energy Conservation**

All new development in unincorporated Mono County, and major remodeling, such as home additions, must comply with the Title 24 of the California Administrative Energy Code. Title 24 implements energy efficiency standards relating to wall and ceiling insulation, thermal mass, and window-to-floor area ratios designed to reduce heat loss and energy consumption.

Mono County General Plan policies encourage the "prudent use of energy and allow substitution of alternative energy sources for conventional energy when such substitution would result in minimal environmental impacts." Policies allow for the use of alternative energy sources, such as passive and active solar, in new residential construction, and encourage energy conservation, including weatherization programs. Several state and local agencies provide energy assistance and weatherization programs for low-income residents in Mono County.

## **KEY FINDINGS – Non-Governmental Constraints**

- Land costs vary significantly throughout Mono County depending on a number of factors. No one area has overall lower or higher land costs; it depends on the parcel in question.
- Due to the wide range of land costs, fees and development requirements throughout the County, it is very difficult to estimate a "typical" total development cost for single-family residential development.
- Financing for home construction or purchase is now generally available to Mono County residents at competitive rates. A number of government-assisted loan programs to enable low- and moderate-income households to construct or purchase housing are generally available to Mono County residents.
- Mono County does not have any multifamily rental housing that could be converted to market rate rents.
- All new development and major remodeling in Mono County must comply with state energy code requirements. The Mono County General Plan promotes alternative energy sources and encourages energy conservation. Local and state agencies provide energy assistance and weatherization programs for low-income residents in Mono County.

## **KEY FINDINGS BY PLANNING AREA**

### *Antelope Valley*

- Population has remained relatively stable. Growth pressures not anticipated.
- Higher numbers of Hispanic and American Indian persons than elsewhere in the unincorporated area.
- Higher numbers of seniors and children under age 5 than elsewhere.
- Rental rate – 50%.
- Overpayment – 18% of households.
- Higher numbers of large households and female-headed households than elsewhere.
- High travel times to work and high numbers working outside the County and outside the state.

- Higher number of persons below poverty level than elsewhere, although that number has decreased.
- Higher number of persons with Social Security and Supplemental Security income than elsewhere.
- Higher numbers of two- to four-unit multifamily residences and mobile homes than elsewhere.
- Some Mixed Use (MU) zoning in Walker that allows multifamily units.
- Individual wells and septic systems required.

### ***Bridgeport Valley***

- Population has remained relatively stable. Growth pressures not anticipated.
- Some Hispanic and American Indian population.
- Rental rate – 39%.
- Overpayment – 21% of households.
- High number of seasonal use units – Twin Lakes area.
- Moderate number of female-headed households.
- Low travel times to work.
- Low number of persons below poverty level.
- Higher number of two- to four-unit multifamily residences than elsewhere.
- Higher numbers of units built 30+ years ago, 40+ years ago, or 50+ years ago than elsewhere.
- Some Mixed Use (MU) zoning in Bridgeport community that allows multifamily units.
- Community sewer and water in Bridgeport; community water in Evans Tract; individual wells and septic systems elsewhere.

### ***Mono Basin***

- Population has remained relatively stable. Growth pressures not anticipated.
- Higher number of Hispanic persons than elsewhere.
- Rental rate – 26%.
- Overpayment – 14% of households.
- No female-headed households.
- Low travel time to work.
- Low number of persons below poverty level but greater number of persons with Public Assistance income.
- Higher number of units built 30+ and 40+ years ago than elsewhere.
- Some Commercial zoning in Lee Vining that allows multifamily units subject to Use Permit.
- Community sewer and water in Lee Vining. Mutual water company in Mono City. Individual wells and septic systems elsewhere.

### ***June Lake***

- Population has decreased. Need for affordable housing anticipated.
- Slightly lower number of Hispanic persons than elsewhere.
- Rental rate – 34%.
- High number of seasonal use units.
- Overpayment – 38% of households.
- Higher number of female-headed households.

- Low travel time to work.
- Low number of persons below poverty level but they are in female-headed households and greater number of persons with Public Assistance income than elsewhere.
- Higher number of persons with self-employment income than elsewhere.
- Higher number of 2-4 unit multifamily units and 5+ multifamily units than elsewhere.
- Higher number of units built 50+ years ago than elsewhere.
- Various zoning that allows multifamily units; i.e., Multifamily Residential – Low, Moderate, and High, Mixed Use, and Commercial Lodging – Moderate and High.
- Community sewer and water but distribution system needs improvements.

### *Long Valley*

- Population has increased and is expected to continue to increase. Growth pressures anticipated including a need for affordable housing.
- Higher number of Hispanic persons than elsewhere.
- Higher numbers of seniors and children under age 5 than elsewhere.
- Rental rate – 14%.
- High number of seasonal-use units.
- Overpayment – 28% of households.
- Higher number of large households (5+ persons) than elsewhere.
- Low number of female-headed households but the number is increasing.
- Medium travel time to work.
- Low number of persons below poverty level but they are in female-headed households.
- Higher number of persons with self-employment income than elsewhere.
- Higher number of 5+ multifamily units than elsewhere.
- Higher number of units built 40+ and 50+ years ago than elsewhere.
- Some Mixed Use and Multifamily Residential-Moderate zoning along Crowley Lake Drive that allows multifamily residential units.
- Water and sewer available in Crowley Lake. Water available in Sunny Slopes. Water available in Rimrock Ranch area of Wheeler Crest. Individual wells and septic systems required elsewhere.

### *Tri-Valley*

- Population has remained relatively stable. Growth pressures anticipated, particularly in Chalfant.
- Slightly lower numbers of Hispanic persons than elsewhere.
- Higher numbers of American Indians than elsewhere in the unincorporated area.
- Higher number of seniors than elsewhere.

- Rental rate – 23%.
- Overpayment – 10% of households.
- Higher number of large households (5+ persons) than elsewhere.
- Moderate number of female-headed households.
- High travel time to work; many residents work outside the County.
- Higher number of persons below poverty level than elsewhere but the number has declined.
- Higher number of persons with Social Security and Supplemental Security income than elsewhere.
- Higher number of mobile homes than elsewhere.
- Extremely limited Commercial and Mixed Use zoning that would allow for multifamily residential units.
- Individual wells and septic systems required.

## VI. HOUSING PROGRAM

---

### STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

Local governments have the responsibility to adopt a program that implements the policies, goals and objectives of the Housing Element through their vested powers, particularly over land use and development controls, regulatory concessions and incentives and the utilization of financial resources. Policies guide housing development within the locality.

Programs are the specific action steps the locality will take to implement its policies and achieve its goals and objectives. Programs must include a specific time frame for implementation and identify the agencies or officials responsible for implementation. Effective program descriptions also include:

- immediate, short-term and long-term action steps;
- proposed measurable outcomes; and
- specific funding sources, where appropriate.

### HOUSING POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

#### OVERALL HOUSING GOAL

Provide an adequate supply of sound and safe affordable housing for all County residents.

#### PROVISION OF ADEQUATE SITES

- Goal** Plan for adequate sites and facilities to support future housing needs.
- Policy 1** Facilitate the provision of housing in unincorporated communities to meet local housing demand.
- Policy 2** Ensure that adequate infrastructure exists or will be provided to support future housing development.
- Policy 3** Identify potential housing sites, including seasonal housing units on public lands, agency employee housing (USFS, BLM, Caltrans, LADWP and Mono County), and under-utilized sites.
- Policy 4** Seek adequate sites for housing in Mono County and the Eastern Sierra through coordination with other public agencies (i.e., Town of Mammoth Lakes, Inyo County, USFS, BLM, Caltrans, LADWP, DFG, State Parks and Marine Corps), private concerns, nonprofit entities and tribal governments.
- Policy 5** Plan for adequate sites and facilities to be available for housing all segments of the population, including the homeless; citizens in need of short-term emergency shelter housing (e.g., victims of natural hazard occurrences or accidents and temporarily homeless); and seasonal workers, including farm workers and ski industry workers.
- Policy 6** Utilize a Regional Housing Authority or similar entity to develop, implement and manage housing programs in Mono County and the Eastern Sierra.



**Policy 7** Consistent with the Land Use Element, designate adequate sites for a variety of residential development in each community to help establish self-sufficient communities that balance job locations with housing; i.e., develop a sufficient year-round residential population in communities to support local schools, commercial services, and other services.

**Program 1 Pursue land exchanges of existing seasonal housing units on public lands into private ownership so those units may become available for local year-round housing. Following completion of the land tenure planning process, identify and prioritize possible land exchanges in areas with existing seasonal housing.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: 2011/12 .

Funding: Mono County, U.S. Forest Service, and permit holders.

Actions: Initiate and complete land exchanges once the land tenure planning process is completed.

**Program 2 Inventory existing and/or potential agency housing areas (Mono County, Town of Mammoth Lakes, Southern Mono Hospital District, Mammoth Unified School District, USFS, BLM, Caltrans, LADWP, etc.) and work with agencies to assess where additional housing might be made available.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2010.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: This will be completed as part of the land tenure planning process.

**Program 3 Work with public agencies (USFS, BLM, Caltrans, LADWP, etc.) to consolidate services and land uses (e.g., road shops) in order to free up land for housing, particularly affordable housing. Consistent with land use policies, encourage agencies to locate their housing within or adjacent to existing communities to facilitate sustainable community growth.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Public Works Department, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: 2011.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: Following completion of the land tenure planning process, the focus will be on working with public agencies to free up land for housing.

**Program 4 Examine the inventory of County-owned land for potential housing sites (e.g., road shop sites, Conway Ranch, Sheriff Substation, etc).**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2010.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: The County will complete its assessment of which County-owned land is available for development and will map the results, showing what type of development is allowed on each parcel identified and the availability of infrastructure on-site.

**Program 5 Study the possibility of acquiring/exchanging public lands surrounding existing community areas for community expansion purposes and/or related infrastructure development, particularly in those areas designated in the Land Use Element for community expansion. Based on the results of these studies, take necessary actions to promote the exchange of lands and encourage the development of a variety of housing types, including multifamily for lower-income households in the acquisition/exchange of public lands.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2012.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: Following completion of the land tenure planning process, County staff will prioritize possible land exchanges.

**Program 6 Implement policies in the Land Use Element pertaining to the provision of services and the coordination of development with service capability. Work with local service providers (public utility districts, fire protection districts, gas/electric power providers, telephone/communications systems providers, etc.) to ensure that adequate services are or will be available for housing development.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Environmental Health.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: Ongoing as development is proposed, approved and constructed. No adjustments proposed.

**Program 7 Encourage and assist special districts and private service providers (mutual water companies etc.) to secure grants to improve and expand sewer and water capabilities and fire protection services. The County's participation will entail aiding districts in the preparation of grant applications and in compliance with environmental requirements.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Environmental Health Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: Starting in 2011, the County will identify one district or service provider per year to assist in securing grants to improve and expand service provision.

**Program 8 The County has identified its community centers as emergency shelters and has obtained funds to upgrade emergency generators at each site and to obtain an emergency services trailer for each community.**

**Monitor the need for permanent emergency shelters. Apply for emergency housing funds available from the Department of Housing and Community Development or other state or federal agencies when it is determined that there is an unmet need for emergency housing.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority, Mono County Office of Emergency Services.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Grants.

Actions: Monitor the need for a permanent emergency shelter on an ongoing basis.

**Program 9 Ensure that the County's Multi-Hazard Functional Plan, prepared by the County's Office of Emergency Services, remains up-to-date. The Multi-Hazard Functional Plan contains policies and procedures for housing victims of natural hazards or accidents.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Office of Emergency Services.

Timeframe: Update the Plan in 2012.

Funding: Grants.

Actions: Pursue grant funding for an update in 2012.

**Program 10 Continue to provide short-term housing for homeless persons and to monitor the need to increase services for homeless persons.**

Responsible Agencies: Department of Social Services, IMACA.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: State & Federal Social Service Funds; General Fund.

Actions: IMACA provides vouchers for short-term housing for homeless persons. Social Services and IMACA monitor the number of homeless they serve in the County.

**Program 11 Implement housing policies contained in area plans, such as the June Lake Area Plan.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Applications Fees; Compliance Fees; General Fund.

Actions: Ongoing through regular meetings with the June Lake Community Advisory Committee.

**Program 12 Consistent with the Land Use Element, continue to require specific plans for large-scale development within community expansion areas. Specific plans allow for a variety of development and can streamline the development process.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application Fees.

Action: Ongoing as development occurs.

**Program 13 In conformance with state law, continue to permit manufactured housing on all parcels designated for conventional single-family residences.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application Fees.

Actions: Ongoing as development occurs.

**Program 14 Continue to permit mobile-home parks on all land planned and designated for residential land use, in conformance with state law. This also applies to mobile-home developments intended for sale as mobile-home condos or cooperative parks, or as mobile-home planned unit developments.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application Fees.

Actions: Ongoing as development occurs.

**Program 15 Continue to implement the land development regulations regarding Manufactured Housing Subdivisions. These regulations provide for a higher density of single-family development and a relaxation of development standards.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application Fees.

Actions: Ongoing as development occurs.

**Program 16 Support a balance of jobs and housing in Mono County communities and the associated reduction in resident commute times by facilitating community job growth through economic development programs. Pursue grant funding for economic development projects that grow jobs and healthy communities capable of supporting more resident housing.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Grants; Economic Development Funds.

Actions: Pursue grant funding for economic development annually from 2007-2014.

**Program 17 Implement provisions in the General Plan and Subdivision Ordinance that permit smaller minimum lot sizes where consistent with area plans and available infrastructure.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application Fees.

Actions: Ongoing during the development process.

**Program 18 Reexamine residential limitations in area plans where new sewer, water or other infrastructure requirements, such as fire-flow requirements, allow for greater single-family densities. Consider amending the General Plan and area plans to allow for higher single-family densities in these areas.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2012.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: During General Plan revisions in 2012.

**Program 19 Continue to allow for mixed-use development as a method of increasing the land base available for housing.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application Fees.

Actions: Ongoing during development process.

**Program 20 Continue to allow for residential development in the commercial land use designation to more efficiently and economically utilize the county's limited land base for housing.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application Fees.

Actions: Ongoing during development process.

**Program 21 Consider amending the General Plan and subdivision ordinance to allow for greater flexibility in subdivision design to encourage clustering, zero lot line and common-wall developments, and other residential design strategies that allow for development at the gross allowable density while preserving sensitive site features.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2010.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: The County is in the process of revising its Subdivision Ordinance. Revisions of the Land Development Regulations in the General Plan is an ongoing process, with input from community planning groups and the Planning Commission.

**Program 22 Examine the potential of allowing additional densities in existing specific plan areas within or adjacent to communities to better utilize available infrastructure and limited private land base.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2010.

Funding: General Fund.

Actions: Continue to explore with community planning groups.

**Program 23 Consider establishing minimum allowable densities (in addition to retaining maximum density restrictions) in appropriate community areas to encourage resident housing.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: Continue to consider for specific projects as development is proposed.

**Program 24 Continue development credit programs in agricultural valleys such as Bridgeport and Hammil that promote the retention of large agricultural parcels for farming purposes by requiring clustered residential development on smaller parcels.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application Fees; General Fund.

Actions: The County is in the process of examining several components of the Development Credit Program including allowed land uses, clarifying the process, the issue of farm labor housing, and the process of transferring development credits to off-site parcels more suitable for development. Once the study is completed, the Land Use Element will be amended to reflect applicable changes in the Development Credit Program. The Land Use Maps will also be amended to include the allowed development credits on each applicable parcel on the land use maps.

**Program 25 Develop and implement a program to connect second-home owners with those needing seasonal housing and consider methods of encouraging second-home owners to make vacation units available for resident use or seasonal employee housing.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority.

Timeframe: 2012.

Funding: Grants.

Actions: ---

**Program 26 Continue to utilize the Director Review permit process (ministerial permit process) to allow multifamily in multifamily designations and designations such as MFR-M and MFR-H.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application Fees.

Actions: Ongoing during development process.

**Program 27 In compliance with Government Code Section 65583(a)(4), allow emergency shelters in at least one land use designation without a use permit or other discretionary permit. Amend the General Plan Land**

**Use Element to a) include a definition of Emergency Shelter; b) allow emergency shelters outright in the Public Facility (PF) land use designation—and in multi-family land designations (such as MFR); and c) stipulate that emergency shelters will only be subject to the same development and management standards that apply to other allowed uses with these designations.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2010.

Funding: General Fund.

Actions: Include these amendments during the General Plan Update process.

**Program 28 In compliance with Government Code Section 65583(a)(4), allow transitional and supportive housing as a residential use in all land use designations where similar housing types are allowed. Amend the General Plan Land Use Element to a) include definitions of transitional and supportive housing; b) allow transitional and supportive housing as a residential use in all land use designations where similar housing types are allowed; and c) stipulate that transitional and supportive housing must be subject only to the restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same designation.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2012.

Funding: General Fund.

Actions: Include these amendments during the General Plan Update process.

## **HOUSING FOR LOW AND MODERATE INCOMES**

- Goal** Consistent with state requirements, pursue creative, economical and sustainable ways to house low- and moderate-income groups.
- Policy 1** Facilitate the provision of affordable housing to meet the needs of all economic segments and special housing groups.
- Policy 2** Plan for a sufficient number of affordable/employee housing units, including affordable family sized units to meet resident needs in each community.
- Policy 3** Increase the housing stock to provide for affordable/employee housing units by promoting the use of existing recreational second-home units for permanent residents.
- Policy 4** Promote a jobs/housing balance by awarding residents employed in their community preferential access to community housing programs, such housing purchases or rentals in that community.
- Policy 5** Require new development projects to provide their fair share of affordable housing units – an amount sufficient to accommodate the affordable housing demand created by the development project. Refine and continue use of inclusionary housing requirements to reflect a fair share contribution of units,



in-lieu fees, land, etc. Coordinate regional housing mitigation and fee impact programs with those of the Town of Mammoth Lakes.

**Policy 6** Pursue a variety of techniques, such as equity sharing, deed restrictions, and public or nonprofit ownership of affordable housing units in order to maintain the affordability of those units.

**Policy 7** Develop a range of approaches to affordable housing that address rental units, home ownership and alternative approaches to affordable housing, such as:

- a threshold fund that provides zero interest security deposit loans for tenants;
- apartments for fixed-income seniors;
- a community land trust used to acquire land for housing;
- sweat-equity programs that enable first-time buyers to contribute their time/labor toward the purchase of a home;
- co-housing for income qualified buyers;
- deed restrictions;
- energy efficient designs; and
- "share a house" programs designed to ease the burden of housing costs for residents, including seniors and disabled.

**Policy 8** Work to develop a variety of affordable housing unit types within community areas.

**Policy 9** Based upon state regional housing need allocations, assign proportionate housing targets to unincorporated communities. Assist each community in meeting these targets and providing for its fair share of the unincorporated housing need.

**Program 1 The Board of Supervisors shall award density bonuses for projects incorporating affordable housing consistent with the Mono County Housing Mitigation Requirements (Chapter 15.40, Mono County Code).**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application fees; General Fund.

Actions: Mono County has awarded density bonuses to projects incorporating affordable housing (e.g. Rock Creek Ranch), in compliance with the Mono County Housing Mitigation Requirements, and will continue to do so. The Mono County Housing Mitigation Requirements implement California Density Bonus Law (Government Code Section 65915).

**Program 2-The Board of Supervisors may reduce or waive development processing fees for qualifying affordable housing projects in order to facilitate processing. County staff will identify other agencies/districts with fees related to residential construction and will determine if those agencies waive or reduce fees for affordable housing units. Staff will then work with applicable agencies to promote a reduction or waiving of fees for affordable housing projects.**



Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors.  
Timeframe: Work with applicable agencies to promote a reduction or waiving of fees by 2012.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: Mono County has waived development impact fees for qualifying projects and will continue to do so.

**Program 3 Continue to allow secondary housing units in single-family residential areas as provided by state law and Chapter 16 of the Mono County Land Development Regulations.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application fees.

Actions: Mono County will continue to allow secondary housing units in single-family residential land use designations.

**Program 4 The County shall not impose requirements for housing construction that increase housing costs other than those mandated by state law or those determined necessary to protect the health, welfare and safety of the residents of the County.**

Responsible Agencies: Public Works Department, Environmental Health Department, Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Not applicable.

Actions: Continue to implement program.

**Program 5 Maintain up-to-date information on federal and state housing-related programs and funding opportunities.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014. Provide links by 2010; update annually.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: Provide links on appropriate areas of the County's website to housing-related programs and funding opportunities

**Program 6 The Mono County Housing Authority, in cooperation with local social service agencies and Mammoth Lakes Housing, Inc., shall participate in and coordinate housing programs designed to ease the burden of housing costs for residents, including seniors and disabled.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: Continue to implement program.

**Program 7 During the permit review process, encourage housing designs and site plans that capitalize on solar heating and cooling advantages to reduce utility costs.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Application fees.

Actions: Mono County has encouraged applicants to implement passive and active solar designs into their projects, on a small scale for individual houses in various areas and on a larger scale for housing developments, such as Rock Creek Ranch, currently in the development process. No additional actions are proposed.

**Program 8 Consider allowing an increase in density for those projects built for rental purposes in exchange for an agreement to retain rental units at an affordable price in perpetuity.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: 2011.

Funding: Application fees.

Actions: Staff will develop proposal for Planning Commission consideration.

**Program 9 Development projects and building permits shall comply with the Mono County Housing Requirements (Mono County Code 15.40), which requires development projects to include affordable housing. The continued affordability of these units shall be assured through enforceable documents/deed restrictions that flow with the sale or ownership transference of the property. Smaller projects shall contribute their fair share via in-lieu housing mitigation fees or other comparable mechanisms. The majority of housing units required by this program must be appropriate for families; i.e., not dormitory-style units, and must be reserved for families/households employed in the local economy.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Development fees.

Actions: Continue to implement program.

**Program 10 Implement housing impact fees and other applicable mitigation strategies based on recommendations from fee impact studies that document the fair share impact of new development on the limited housing supply. Coordinate regional housing mitigation and fee impact programs with those of the Town of Mammoth Lakes.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: Coordinate with Mammoth Lakes by 2010; review and update annually.

Funding: Development fees.

Actions: Continue implementation of housing impact fees as development occurs.

**Program 11** Through collaboration with a regional housing authority or similar entity, develop a range of affordable housing programs that address rental units, home ownership and alternative approaches to affordable housing, such as:

- a threshold fund that provides zero interest security deposit loans for tenants;
- apartments for fixed-income seniors;
- a community land trust used to acquire land for housing;
- sweat-equity programs that enable first-time buyers to contribute their time/labor toward the purchase of a home;
- co-housing for income qualified buyers;
- deed restrictions; and
- energy efficient designs.

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority.

Timeframe: Develop additional alternatives by 2010. Begin implementation of at least one additional program by 2011 and a second program by 2013.

Funding: Grants.

Actions: Continue to implement existing alternatives and develop additional alternatives, including, but not limited to those listed above.

**Program 12** The County will meet with developers and encourage the development of housing for low- and moderate-income households. The County will maintain an inventory of suitable sites, conduct preapplication meetings to facilitate development, provide technical assistance, support appropriate funding applications and offer regulatory incentives and concessions to contribute to the feasibility of development of housing for lower-income households. The inventory of suitable sites will utilize a variety of factors to determine site suitability, including current and projected population figures, economic conditions, transportation systems, the potential for rehabilitation, and the availability of utilities and infrastructure.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Develop an inventory of suitable sites by 2010. Continue to encourage the development of low and moderate income housing over the time frame of this plan.

Funding: General Fund

Actions: Continue program implementation as development occurs.

**Program 13** Through collaboration with a regional housing authority or similar entity (e.g. Mammoth Lakes Housing Inc), develop a range of housing programs that address the needs of Extremely Low-Income households in the area. Identify the specific type(s) of development that would best serve the needs of this group in Mono County. Review the county's

**Housing Mitigation Ordinance and other development standards to ensure that they encourage the development of housing types that meet the needs of this income group. Seek funding to develop ELI housing.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority.

Timeframe: Identify development types by 2010. Review Housing Mitigation Ordinance and development standards by 2010. Seek funding starting in 2011.

Funding: Grants.

Actions: See above.

**Program 14 Review and revise the Housing Mitigation Requirements (Mono County Code, Chapter 15.40) to ensure that they remain effective and equitable in today's housing market.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2010.

Funding: General Fund.

Actions: Ensure that the development community is engaged throughout the process.

## **PROGRAMS TO ADDRESS GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS**

**Goal** Increase housing opportunities throughout the County, particularly in community areas by limiting governmental constraints on housing development.

**Policy 1** Revise the Land Development Regulations of the General Plan to allow for greater flexibility in housing development in communities by substituting performance standards/criteria for rigid development standards where practical.

**Policy 2** Revise the County's Subdivision Ordinance to provide greater flexibility in the division of land for a variety of housing types and to ensure consistency with the General Plan.

**Program 1 Review and consider revising development standards to provide for greater regulatory flexibility that promotes resident housing development opportunities. Issues and standards to review include, but are not limited to:**

- **parking requirements, particularly in June Lake and older central business districts;**
- **snow storage requirements;**
- **allowing smaller minimum lot sizes where appropriate for affordability;**
- **broader application of the County's Manufactured Housing Subdivision provisions, which allows for lots as small as 4,000 square feet; and**

- **establishing performance criteria as a substitute for some existing inflexible regulations for residential development.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Regional Planning Advisory Committees, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Review development standards biannually, starting in 2011.

Funding: General Fund.

Actions: Revising the County's Development Standards is an ongoing process.

**Program 2 Consider revising the Land Development Regulations to clarify the use of manufactured housing, including requirements in non-residential land use designations, minimum standards for farm labor housing use, and the ability to propose manufactured housing subdivisions within additional land use designations.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Regional Planning Advisory Committees, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: 2011/12.

Funding: General Fund.

Actions: Revising the County's Land Development Regulations is an ongoing process.

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Regional Planning Advisory Committees, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: 2010-2011.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: The County is currently in the process of revising its subdivision ordinance.

**Program 4 Conduct preapplication conferences with project proponents to assist them in understanding permit procedures and to resolve potential application difficulties early in the review process.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Land Development Technical Advisory Committee (LDTAC) = Planning Division, Building Division, Public Works Department, Environmental Health, and Compliance Division.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Development fees.

Actions: See program.

**Program 5 Review permit-processing procedures to ensure streamlining of the permit process. Review and revise application packets, as needed, to ensure that they are comprehensive, clear and easy to use.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: Review permit processing procedures and application materials biannually starting in 2011.s

Funding: General Fund.

Actions: The County periodically reviews its permit processing and application materials to ensure that they are streamlined and easy to use. The County is

currently in the process of switching to electronic permit processing in order to better integrate the departments involved in permitting.

**Program 6 Amend the Land Development Regulations to provide a procedure for handling requests for reasonable accommodations made pursuant to state and federal fair housing laws.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: 2010.

Funding: General Fund.

Actions: The County has an extremely small number of applications involving persons with disabilities. In the past, these cases have been handled through the normal permitting process that provides reasonable accommodation for variances related to improvements for persons with disabilities. The County recognizes that using existing entitlement procedures, such as use permits or variances, for handling requests for reasonable accommodations does not use fair housing legal standards, and, furthermore, local jurisdictions have an affirmative duty to provide reasonable accommodation. Community opposition may be invited through a conditional use permit process, and such opposition is often grounded in stereotypical assumptions about people with disabilities and unfounded concerns about the impact of such housing on surrounding property values.

## CONSERVATION AND REHABILITATION

**Goal** Ensure the supply of safe, decent, sound housing for all residents.

**Policy 1** Promote energy conservation in all residential neighborhoods.

**Policy 2** Promote public awareness of the need for energy conservation.

**Policy 3** Support development of programs and policies that achieve a high level of energy conservation in all new and rehabilitated housing units.

**Policy 4** Ensure that housing for all residents is safe and sound.

**Policy 5** Maintain the existing affordable housing stock through rehabilitation, replacement and conservation.

**Program 1 Continue to implement General Plan policies concerning the use of alternative energy sources (active and passive solar, etc.) in the development, rehabilitation, and replacement of housing units, including enforcement of Title 24 of the California Energy Commission Regulations.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department/Building Division.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Development fees.

Actions: Implement General Plan policies during the building permit and/or development process.

**Program 2 Support the continuation of home weatherization programs offered by state agencies, utility companies and other groups.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority in cooperation with local social service agencies, utilities, and the High Sierra Energy Foundation.

Timeframe: Provide links on website by 2010; update annually.

Funding: Grants.

Actions: Provide links on appropriate areas of the County's website to information on home weatherization and to the High Sierra Energy Foundation website.

**Program 3 Make information available to homeowners and renters regarding weatherization and other programs that may assist in maintaining the affordability of housing units.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority.

Timeframe: Provide links on website by 2010; update annually.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: Provide links on appropriate areas of the County's website to information on home weatherization and to the High Sierra Energy Foundation website.

**Program 4 Periodically update the housing conditions survey to identify areas in Mono County that would benefit from rehabilitation.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority, Community Development Department/Building Division.

Timeframe: One year prior to required Housing Element Updates.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: A comprehensive housing conditions survey was completed in July 2009. The resulting information will be mapped on the County's GIS system. Subsequently, update the survey one year prior to the required Housing Element Update and map the results.

**Program 5 Continue to participate in the state's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program for rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing units. The County's goal is to rehabilitate 40 units during the planning period. The County will apply annually for CDBG funds.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority

Timeframe: Develop a quantified objective for this program by 2010.

Funding: Grants.

Actions: Following completion of the housing conditions survey, the County will determine the need for rehabilitation of owner-occupied housing units and will develop a quantified objective for this program.

**Program 6 Provide community education regarding the availability of rehabilitation programs and provide public outreach regarding the availability of rehabilitation programs to low- and very low-income**



**households and other special needs groups in areas identified as needing rehabilitation.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority.

Timeframe: Provide links on website by 2010; update annually. Begin public outreach concerning rehabilitation programs by 2010.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: Provide links on appropriate areas of the County's website to information on rehabilitation loans. Areas identified as needing rehabilitation by the housing conditions survey will be targeted with public outreach concerning rehabilitation programs.

**Program 7 Assist applicants in accessing home rehabilitation loans.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority.

Timeframe: Provide links on website by 2010; update annually. Assist with home rehabilitation loans annually.

Funding: Grants; General Fund.

Actions: Provide links on appropriate areas of the County's website to information on rehabilitation loans. Areas identified as needing rehabilitation by the housing conditions survey will be targeted with public outreach concerning rehabilitation programs.

**Program 8 Consider methods to encourage the private rehabilitation of housing, particularly rental housing.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: General fund.

Actions: By 2012, develop data on methods to encourage the private rehabilitation of housing, particularly rental housing for the Board's consideration.

**Program 9 Consider developing an active rental inspection program to ensure rental housing maintenance. This may require a fee to support inspection services. Careful consideration should be given to the fee structure to avoid increasing the costs of rental housing. Also consider a "self-certification program" for landlords who participate in a maintenance/management training program. Apply for and utilize CDBG funds to ensure affordability will not be affected by maintenance activities.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority, Community Development Department/Code Enforcement Division.

Timeframe: Implement action items listed below by 2012.

Funding: Inspection fees; Grants.

Actions: Identify units needing maintenance or rehabilitation in the current housing conditions survey. Develop a database of rental housing throughout the unincorporated area. Consider the possibility of a rental inspection program.



**Program 10 Encourage the private rehabilitation of housing through enforcement of the property maintenance provisions of the various building codes enforced by the County.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department/Code Enforcement and Building Divisions.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Compliance fees.

Actions: The Code Enforcement Division identifies and addresses property maintenance issues throughout the County.

**Program 11 Encourage the rehabilitation of existing units over their demolition where practical through such measures as:**

- **Providing flexibility in administering building code requirements to facilitate the repair, remodel and refurbishment of existing units instead of their demolition;**
- **Developing a user-friendly process for repair, remodel and refurbishment, including handouts;**
- **Providing courtesy walk-through field assistance for owners seeking help in determining if demolition is necessary;**
- **Considering fee reductions and fast-track permit review for qualifying remodels; and**
- **Conducting outreach to communities and development interests regarding programs available for repair, remodel and refurbishment.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department.

Timeframe: See actions below.

Funding: Compliance fees; General Fund.

Actions: Determine which of the above measures would be feasible in Mono County and developing an implementation schedule with implementation of at least one measure starting in 2012.

## **EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES**

**Goal** Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons.

**Policy 1** Ensure that information on fair housing laws is easily available.

**Policy 2** Ensure that complaints about housing discrimination are addressed promptly and appropriately.

**Program 1 Disseminate and maintain fair housing information and education materials throughout the County and ensure public awareness of fair housing laws and processes. Materials will be distributed in a variety of public locations including government centers, libraries, post offices, and shopping areas.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority.

Timeframe: Provide links on website by 2010; update annually.

Funding: General Fund.

Actions: Provide links on appropriate areas of the County's website to sources of fair housing information. The Mono County Housing Authority will become the responsible agency for program implementation.

**Program 2 Refer persons with complaints of housing discrimination to appropriate agencies such as IMACA, the Department of Social Services, or the district office of the Department of Fair Employment and Housing.**

Responsible Agencies: Mono County Housing Authority.

Timeframe: Provide links on website by 2010; update annually.

Funding: General Fund.

Actions: Provide links on appropriate areas of the County's website to sources of fair housing information. The Mono County Housing Authority will become the responsible agency for program implementation.

## **PRESERVING UNITS AT RISK OF CONVERSION TO MARKET RATE USES**

**Goal** Preserve development reserved for low-income and/or employee housing uses at risk of conversion to market rates.

**Policy 1** Ensure that units designated for low-income and/or employee housing uses remain restricted to those uses.

**Policy 2** Ensure that units generally considered affordable (i.e., mobile homes) remain as residential uses.

**Policy 3** Ensure that units participating in state or federal rental assistance or subsidy programs remain in those programs to retain affordability.

### **Program 1 Legally restrict units intended for low-income and/or employee housing uses to those uses.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Development fees; General Fund.

Actions: Implement legal restrictions during the building permit and/or development process.

### **Program 2 Continue to enforce regulations in the Mono County General Plan concerning the conversion of residential facilities or mobile-home spaces in a mobile-home park to other uses.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Development fees; General Fund.

Actions: Enforce regulations during the building permit and/or development process.

### **Program 3 Provide incentives for property owners to participate in state or federally funded rental assistance or subsidy programs. These incentives may include fee reductions, administrative (grant) assistance, and streamlined permit processing for rehabilitations.**

Responsible Agencies: Community Development Department, Planning Commission.

Timeframe: Ongoing, 2007-2014.

Funding: Development fees; General Fund.

Actions: By 2010, include information on the County's website about permit streamlining for projects involving state or federally funded rental assistance

or subsidy programs. By 2010, consider amending the development fee schedule to provide fee reductions for this type of project.

## VII. REFERENCES

---

### References Consulted

- California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)  
**Housing Element Building Blocks.** 2009.  
**Regional Housing Needs Plan.** 2009.  
**Template for the Preparation of Housing Elements in Frontier Counties: Mono County Housing Template.** 2009.
- California Employment Development Department (EDD), Labor Market Information Division (LMID)  
**Mono County Profile.** 2009.
- Mono County Community Development Department  
**Building/Planning Guide: Buying and Developing Property in Mono County.** 2003.  
**Housing Conditions Survey.** 2003.
- Mono County Code  
**Mono County Land Development Regulations (Revised Land Use Element).** 2007.
- Mono County Health and Human Services Agency  
**Mental Health Services Act, Community Services and Supports, 3-Year Program and Expenditure Plan Requirements.** 2006.
- Mono County Planning Division  
**June Lake Area Plan: June Lake 2010.** Revised 2003.  
**Mono County Environmental Handbook.** 2003.  
**Mono County General Plan.** 1993.  
**Mono County General Plan, Revised Land Use Element and Land Development Regulations.** 2001.  
**Mono County Housing Element.** 2007.  
**Mono County Master Environmental Assessment.** 2001.
- Mono County Public Works Department  
**County of Mono Road Improvement Standards.** 1981.
- Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates  
**Lee Vining Main Street Workshops Final Report.** February 1999.

Sierra Business Council

**Conference on Community Affordable Housing.** Fall 2003.

## Persons Consulted

Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action, Bishop.  
Daniel Steinhagen, Director

Inyo Mono Area Agency on Aging, Bishop.

Inyo Mono Association for the Handicapped, Bishop.  
Beth Himelhoch, Executive Director

Kern Regional Center, Bishop.  
Michael Bowers, Director

Mono County Assessors Office.  
Pete Eilertson, Administrative Operations Manager  
Susan Peters, Appraiser Aide

Mono County Community Development Department.  
Scott Burns, Community Development Director  
Sharon Carkeet, Planning and Building Permit Technician  
Rick McManis, Building Official  
Gwen Plummer, Senior Planner

Mono County Department of Social Services.  
Julie Timerman, Administrative Program Manager  
Ed Zylman, Director

Mono County Health and Human Services Agency  
Ann Gimpel, Mental Health Director

Prestige Properties of Mammoth.  
Dennis C. Cox, Sales Associate

Town of Mammoth Lakes.  
Bill Taylor, Senior Planner

Walker River Real Estate.  
Rose Murray, Owner/Broker

## Internet Reference Sites

The current Internet address at the time of printing is listed for these sources; the address may have changed since printing.

### Local Agencies

---

**Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action, Inc (IMACA)**

Workforce housing in Mammoth Lakes.

[www.imaca.net](http://www.imaca.net)

**Inyo Mono Area Agency on Aging (IMAAA)**

Workforce housing in Mammoth Lakes.

[www.inyoCounty.us/imaaa](http://www.inyoCounty.us/imaaa)

**Inyo-Mono Association for the Handicapped (IMAH)**

Workforce housing in Mammoth Lakes.

[www.inyomonoah.org](http://www.inyomonoah.org)

**Mammoth Lakes Housing, Inc.**

Workforce housing in Mammoth Lakes.

[www.mammothlakeshousing.com](http://www.mammothlakeshousing.com)

**Mono County**

Programs and policies in Mono County, departmental data.

[www.monoCounty.ca.gov](http://www.monoCounty.ca.gov)

**Southern California Edison**

Energy conservation and assistance

[www.sce.com](http://www.sce.com)

**Town of Mammoth Lakes**

Programs and policies in Mammoth Lakes.

[www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us](http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us)

**Utu Utu Gwaitu Paiute Tribe (Benton Paiute Reservation)**

Information on tribe policies and programs

[www.bentonpaiuterreservation.com](http://www.bentonpaiuterreservation.com)

## State Agencies

---

### **Board of Equalization**

Economic statistics (Countywide level).

[www.boe.ca.gov](http://www.boe.ca.gov)

### **Department of Community Services and Development (CSD)**

Information on energy assistance programs.

[www.csd.ca.gov](http://www.csd.ca.gov)

### **Department of Finance (DOF)**

Demographic Research Unit, population and socio-economic statistics and forecasts, California Statistical Abstract.

[www.dof.ca.gov](http://www.dof.ca.gov)

### **Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)**

Housing policies and programs. state and federal housing finance, rehabilitation and economic development programs.

[www.hcd.ca.gov](http://www.hcd.ca.gov)

### **Department of Industrial Relations**

Labor statistics and research (Countywide level).

[www.dir.ca.gov](http://www.dir.ca.gov)

### **Employment Development Department (EDD)**

Labor market information, socioeconomic data, income and poverty statistics (Countywide level), occupational employment statistics.

[www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov](http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov)

## Federal Agencies

---

### **U.S. Census Bureau**

Population, income, and poverty data.

[www.factfinder.census.gov](http://www.factfinder.census.gov)

### **U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service**

Census of agriculture data.

[www.nass.usda.gov](http://www.nass.usda.gov)

### **U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis**

Income, poverty, and other socioeconomic data (Countywide level).

[www.bea.gov](http://www.bea.gov)



**U.S. Department of Housing and Economic Development**  
Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data.  
[www.hud.org](http://www.hud.org)

## VIII. APPENDIX A

---

This appendix contains and a community-by-community summary of outreach, issue identification, and applicable policies for each of the county's regional planning areas.

### Antelope Valley Housing Policy

#### Planning Process

---

On April 2, 2009 Mammoth Lakes Housing staff attended the Antelope Valley RPAC meeting in an effort to better understand the specific housing needs of that community. This session was held as public outreach for the Mono County Housing Element Update. Based on the comments, provided below, a series of Goals and Policies were drafted for consideration by the Antelope Valley RPAC in an effort to better guide housing programs and developments to meet the needs of the community.

#### Existing Housing Element Key Findings

---

- Population has remained relatively stable. Growth pressures not anticipated.
- Higher numbers of Hispanic and American Indian persons than elsewhere in the unincorporated area.
- Higher number of seniors and children under age 5 than elsewhere.
- Rental Rate – 50%
- Overpayment – 18% of households.
- Higher numbers of large households and female-headed households than elsewhere.
- High travel times to work and high numbers working outside the county and outside the state.
- Higher number of persons below poverty level than elsewhere, although that number has decreased.
- Higher number of persons with Social Security and Supplemental Security income than elsewhere.
- Higher number of two- to four-unit multifamily residences and mobile homes than elsewhere.
- Some Mixed Use (MU) zoning in Walker that allows multifamily units.
- Individual wells and septic systems required.

#### Antelope Valley RPAC Comments – April 2, 2009

---

- Area Median Income numbers not an accurate picture of Antelope Valley.
- Need retrofitting funds for current homeowners who cannot afford to modify their home to meet their changing needs. Owner/Rental rehabilitation funds needed.
- Lahontan septic requirements do not allow for enough units to be built in order to make affordable housing pencil.
- Community has a need for affordable housing.
- Need to keep river quality in mind.

## Existing Housing Element Policies & Programs pertinent to Antelope Valley

---

- Goal- To provide an adequate supply of sound, affordable housing units in a safe and satisfying environment for all residents of the county, both present and future.
  - Policy A- Ensure that there are adequate sites and facilities to support future housing needs.
    - Objective 2- Ensure the provision of adequate services for housing development
      - Program 2.1- Encourage and assist special districts to secure grants to improve and expand sewer and water capabilities and fire protection services. The county's participation will entail aiding districts in the preparation of grant applications and in compliance with environmental requirements.
  - Policy B- Work toward attainment of the identified regional housing needs.
    - Objective 1- Meet basic housing construction needs by the construction or placement of approximately 292 units by 2014, if population growth is achieved as expected.
      - Program 1.10- Designate potential areas as community expansion areas/specific plan in the Land Use Element.
    - Objective 2- Encourage the provision of affordable housing to meet the needs of all economic segments and special housing groups.
      - Program 2.9- Maintain an up-to-date file of federal and state housing related programs.
  - Policy C- Maintain and improve the existing housing stock through rehabilitation, replacement and conservation.
    - Objective 1- Provide for the rehabilitation and replacement of units.
      - Program 1.1- Participate in the state's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program for rehabilitation and weatherization assistance.
      - Program 1.3- Increase the public's awareness of rehabilitation programs.
      - Program 1.4- Enforce housing code requirements and develop a housing rehabilitation program.
    - Objective 2- Conserve existing housing units.
      - Program 2.1- Increase the use of home weatherization programs offered by utility companies and other groups by distributing information to homeowners and renters regarding weatherization and other programs that may assist in maintaining the affordability of housing units.
  - Policy E- Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin or color.

- Objective 1- The county shall not allow housing discrimination to interfere with the attainment of its housing goals.

## **Bridgeport Housing Policy**

### **Planning Process**

---

On April 16, 2009 Mammoth Lakes Housing staff attended the Bridgeport RPAC meeting in an effort to better understand the specific housing needs of that community. This session was held as public outreach for the Mono County Housing Element Update. Based on the comments, provided below, the existing Housing Element Policies were reviewed for consistency with community comments.

### **Existing Housing Element Key Findings**

---

- Population has remained relatively stable. Growth pressures not anticipated.
- Some Hispanic and American Indian population.
- Higher number of seniors and children under age 5 than elsewhere.
- Rental Rate – 39%
- Overpayment – 21% of households.
- Higher numbers of seasonal use units – Twin Lakes area.
- Moderate number of female-headed households.
- Low travel times to work.
- Low number of persons below poverty level.
- Higher number of two- to four-unit multifamily residences than elsewhere.
- Higher numbers of units built 30+ years ago, 40+ years ago, or 50+ years ago than elsewhere.
- Some Mixed Use (MU) zoning in Bridgeport community that allows multifamily units.
- Community sewer and water in Bridgeport community and Evans Tract; individual wells and septic systems elsewhere

### **Bridgeport RPAC Comments – April 16, 2009**

---

- Rentals are non-existent. There is extreme difficulty in finding a reasonable affordable place to rent.
- There is a lack of available private land to develop rental housing.
- There is a need in the community for approximately 6 months of seasonal housing per year.
- Many local employees live in Gardnerville, etc. and have to commute.
- Sale of homes to second homeowners is tearing up the community. They don't join in with community activities and cuts into the economy of the town thereby causing the businesses to suffer.

### **Existing Housing Element Policies & Programs pertinent to Bridgeport**

---

- Goal- To provide an adequate supply of sound, affordable housing units in a safe and satisfying environment for all residents of the county, both present and future.

- Policy A- Ensure that there are adequate sites and facilities to support future housing needs.
  - Objective 2- Ensure the provision of adequate services for housing development
    - Program 2.1- Encourage and assist special districts to secure grants to improve and expand sewer and water capabilities and fire protection services. The county's participation will entail aiding districts in the preparation of grant applications and in compliance with environmental requirements.
- Policy B- Work toward attainment of the identified regional housing needs.
  - Objective 1- Meet basic housing construction needs by the construction or placement of approximately 292 units by 2014, if population growth is achieved as expected.
    - Program 1.3- In conformance with state law, permit mobile homes on all parcels zoned for conventional single-family residences.
    - Program 1.9- In communities with a limited private land base and with limited vacant land available for additional residential development, study the possibility of acquiring surrounding public lands for community expansion.
    - Program 1.10- Designate potential areas as community expansion areas/specific plan in the Land Use Element.
  - Objective 2- Encourage the provision of affordable housing to meet the needs of all economic segments and special housing groups.
    - Program 2.9- Maintain an up-to-date file of federal and state housing related programs.
- Policy C- Maintain and improve the existing housing stock through rehabilitation, replacement and conservation.
  - Objective 1- Provide for the rehabilitation and replacement of units.
    - Program 1.1- Participate in the state's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program for rehabilitation and weatherization assistance.
    - Program 1.3- Increase the public's awareness of rehabilitation programs.
    - Program 1.4- Enforce housing code requirements and develop a housing rehabilitation program.
  - Objective 2- Conserve existing housing units.
    - Program 2.1- Increase the use of home weatherization programs offered by utility companies and other groups by distributing information to homeowners and renters regarding weatherization and other programs that may assist in maintaining the affordability of housing units.

- Policy E- Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin or color.
  - Objective 1- The county shall not allow housing discrimination to interfere with the attainment of its housing goals.

## June Lake Housing Policy

### Planning Process

---

On April 7, 2009 Mammoth Lakes Housing staff attended the June Lake CAC meeting in an effort to better understand the specific housing needs of that community. This session was held as public outreach for the Mono County Housing Element Update. Based on the comments, provided below, the existing Housing Element Policies were reviewed for consistency with community comments.

### Existing Housing Element Key Findings

---

- Population has decreased. Need for affordable housing anticipated.
- Slightly lower numbers of Hispanic persons than elsewhere.
- Rental Rate – 34%
- High number of seasonal use units.
- Overpayment – 38% of households.
- Higher number female-headed households.
- Low travel times to work.
- Low number of persons below poverty level but they are in female-headed households and greater number of persons with Public Assistance income than elsewhere.
- Higher number of persons with self-employment income than elsewhere.
- Higher number of 2-4 unit multifamily units and 5+ multifamily units than elsewhere.
- Higher number of units built 50+ years ago than elsewhere.
- Various zoning that allows multifamily units; i.e., Multifamily Residential – Low, Moderate, and High, Mixed Use, and Commercial Lodging – Moderate and High.
- Community sewer and water but distribution system needs improvement.

### June Lake CAC Comments – April 7, 2009

---

- Have a lot of service workers and seasonal workers
- With less construction going on workers have left leaving more market rate rentals available
- With the workforce leaving every night it is tough to grow the community
- Would like statistics on “stacking”
- Lacking housing for young families
- There is a school issue in June Lake – how many families want to be here?
- Both single family and rental needed

- Very low income housing is needed because of the seasonal type of working and median income for a single family
- Vacant second homes – Feds created the issues with IRS laws
- County could incentivize folks to rent their second homes.

### **Existing Housing Element Policies & Programs pertinent to June Lake**

- Goal- To provide an adequate supply of sound, affordable housing units in a safe and satisfying environment for all residents of the county, both present and future.
  - Policy A- Ensure that there are adequate sites and facilities to support future housing needs.
    - Objective 2- Ensure the provision of adequate services for housing development
      - Program 1.5 Continue to require specific plans for large-scale development outside community areas. Specific plans allow for a variety of development and streamline the development process.
      - Program 2.1- Encourage and assist special districts to secure grants to improve and expand sewer and water capabilities and fire protection services. The county’s participation will entail aiding districts in the preparation of grant applications and in compliance with environmental requirements.
  - Policy B- Work toward attainment of the identified regional housing needs.
    - Objective 1- Meet basic housing construction needs by the construction or placement of approximately 292 units by 2014, if population growth is achieved as expected.
      - Program 1.10- Designate potential areas as community expansion areas/specific plan in the Land Use Element.
    - Objective 2- Encourage the provision of affordable housing to meet the needs of all economic segments and special housing groups.
      - Program 2.9- Maintain an up-to-date file of federal and state housing related programs.
    - Objective 3- Ensure that future development provides a sufficient number of affordable employee housing units so that the existing housing stock is not adversely impacted by such development.
      - Program 3.1- Require developers of large-scale developments, such as large multifamily residential projects, commercial lodging projects, or resort projects, to construct affordable employee housing; the continued affordability of employee units shall be assured through enforceable documents that flow with the sale or ownership transference of the property. Unit ratio recommended: one employee unit for 10-50 units; one employee unit per each

- 50 units thereafter. Employee housing units provided for projects will not be considered in determining the maximum density permitted for development projects.
- Policy C- Maintain and improve the existing housing stock through rehabilitation, replacement and conservation.
    - Objective 1- Provide for the rehabilitation and replacement of units.
      - Program 1.1- Participate in the state’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program for rehabilitation and weatherization assistance.
      - Program 1.3- Increase the public’s awareness of rehabilitation programs.
      - Program 1.4- Enforce housing code requirements and develop a housing rehabilitation program.
    - Objective 2- Conserve existing housing units.
      - Program 2.1- Increase the use of home weatherization programs offered by utility companies and other groups by distributing information to homeowners and renters regarding weatherization and other programs that may assist in maintaining the affordability of housing units.
  - Policy E- Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin or color.
    - Objective 1- The county shall not allow housing discrimination to interfere with the attainment of its housing goals.

## Long Valley Housing Policy

### Planning Process

On March 25, 2009 Mammoth Lakes Housing staff attended the Long Valley RPAC meeting in an effort to better understand the specific housing needs of that community. This session was held as public outreach for the Mono County Housing Element Update. Based on the comments, provided below, the existing Housing Element Policies were reviewed for consistency with community comments.

### Existing Housing Element Key Findings

- Population has increased and is expected to continue to increase. Growth pressures anticipated including a need for affordable housing.
- Higher number of Hispanic persons than elsewhere.
- Higher number of seniors and children under age 5 than elsewhere.
- Rental Rate – 14%
- High number of seasonal-use units
- Overpayment – 28% of households
- Higher number of large households (5+ persons) than elsewhere



- Low number of female-headed households but the number is increasing.
- Medium travel time to work.
- Low number of persons below poverty level but they are in female-headed households.
- Higher number of persons with self-employment income than elsewhere.
- Higher number of 5+ multifamily units than elsewhere.
- Higher number of units built 40+ and 50+ years ago than elsewhere.
- Some Mixed Use and Multifamily Residential- Moderate zoning along Crowley Lake Drive that allows multifamily residential units.
- Water and sewer available in Crowley Lake. Water available in Sunny Slopes. Water available in Rimrock Ranch area of Wheeler Crest. Individual wells and septic systems elsewhere.

### **Long Valley RPAC Comments – March 25, 2009**

---

- 28 year old daughter has a very hard time finding affordable housing in Mammoth Lakes.
- Need available and efficient water resources to develop housing. The water issue must be considered.
- Deposits for utilities, first and last month rent and a security deposit makes it very difficult for renters to even get a place.
- County should consider suspending housing mitigation fees for single family new construction.
- Would like to see a survey of existing houses in the community to see the percentage of rentals/ownership and single-family/multifamily homes and compare to the rest of the County. Survey could also solicit additional input on housing related issues. Survey draft should be brought back to RPAC for review.
- Wants housing for nurses, firefighters, teachers, etc.
- Undeveloped lots that are available are limited. Need to be maintained to meet future needs.
- County should act on for-sale rentals so they won't get purchased and rehabbed/replaced to become a higher priced unit.
- County makes it difficult to modify personal lots, especially to develop additional housing.
- Sewer systems need capital reserve account to repair existing issues. With no new construction occurring there are no new fees being collected to meet this need.
- Where and how we place housing is as important as the number of housing units produced. Should look at different mechanisms to retain affordable housing, i.e. down payment assistance and rental assistance.

### **Existing Housing Element Policies & Programs pertinent to Long Valley**

---

- Goal- To provide an adequate supply of sound, affordable housing units in a safe and satisfying environment for all residents of the county, both present and future.
  - Policy A- Ensure that there are adequate sites and facilities to support future housing needs.



- Objective 1- The county shall not allow housing discrimination to interfere with the attainment of its housing goals.

## **Mono Basin Housing Policy**

### **Planning Process**

---

On April 9, 2009 Mammoth Lakes Housing staff attended the Mono Basin RPAC meeting in an effort to better understand the specific housing needs of that community. This session was held as public outreach for the Mono County Housing Element Update. Based on the comments, provided below, the existing Housing Element Policies were reviewed for consistency with community comments.

### **Existing Housing Element Key Findings**

---

- Population has remained relatively stable. Growth pressures not anticipated.
- Higher numbers of Hispanic persons than elsewhere.
- Higher number of seniors and children under age 5 than elsewhere.
- Rental Rate – 26%
- Overpayment – 14% of households.
- No female-headed households.
- Low travel times to work.
- Low number of persons below poverty level but greater number of persons with Public Assistance income.
- Higher number of units built 30+ and 40+ years ago than elsewhere.
- Some Commercial zoning in Lee Vining that allows multifamily units subject to Use Permit.
- Community sewer and water in Lee Vining. Mutual water company in Mono City. Individual wells and septic systems elsewhere.

### **Mono Basin RPAC Comments – April 9, 2009**

---

- Reduce fees to make single family homes more affordable.
- Don't want to see any more growth. There are more people in the Mono Basin now than ever.
- The market has driven up the prices, making homes unaffordable. This in turn affects people's quality of life. Especially the County workers, teachers, Caltrans etc. Local workers have to purchase where homes are affordable and commute to where they work.
- We shouldn't expect government subsidies. This will not address the real problem.
- We need to have an opportunity for the youth to stay in the area if they want and have affordable housing opportunities.
- Homeowners/buyers need more livable space, something nice of a household to live in.

## **Existing Housing Element Policies & Programs pertinent to Mono Basin**

- Goal- To provide an adequate supply of sound, affordable housing units in a safe and satisfying environment for all residents of the county, both present and future.
  - Policy A- Ensure that there are adequate sites and facilities to support future housing needs.
    - Objective 2- Ensure the provision of adequate services for housing development
      - Program 2.1- Encourage and assist special districts to secure grants to improve and expand sewer and water capabilities and fire protection services. The county's participation will entail aiding districts in the preparation of grant applications and in compliance with environmental requirements.
  - Policy B- Work toward attainment of the identified regional housing needs.
    - Objective 1- Meet basic housing construction needs by the construction or placement of approximately 292 units by 2014, if population growth is achieved as expected.
      - Program 1.3- In conformance with state law, permit mobile homes on all parcels zoned for conventional single-family residences.
      - Program 1.9- In communities with a limited private land base and with limited vacant land available for additional residential development, study the possibility of acquiring surrounding public lands for community expansion.
      - Program 1.10- Designate potential areas as community expansion areas/specific plan in the Land Use Element.
    - Objective 2- Encourage the provision of affordable housing to meet the needs of all economic segments and special housing groups.
      - Program 2.9- Maintain an up-to-date file of federal and state housing related programs.
  - Policy C- Maintain and improve the existing housing stock through rehabilitation, replacement and conservation.
    - Objective 1- Provide for the rehabilitation and replacement of units.
      - Program 1.1- Participate in the state's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program for rehabilitation and weatherization assistance.
      - Program 1.3- Increase the public's awareness of rehabilitation programs.
      - Program 1.4- Enforce housing code requirements and develop a housing rehabilitation program.
    - Objective 2- Conserve existing housing units.

- Program 2.1- Increase the use of home weatherization programs offered by utility companies and other groups by distributing information to homeowners and renters regarding weatherization and other programs that may assist in maintaining the affordability of housing units.
  - Policy E- Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin or color.
    - Objective 1- The county shall not allow housing discrimination to interfere with the attainment of its housing goals.

## Tri-Valley Housing Policy

### Planning Process

---

On May 18, 2009 Mammoth Lakes Housing staff attended the Chalfant Valley RPAC meeting, and on May 20, 2009 MLH staff attended the Benton/Hammil RPAC meeting in an effort to better understand the specific housing needs of that community. This session was held as public outreach for the Mono County Housing Element Update. Based on the comments, provided below, the existing Housing Element Policies were reviewed for consistency with community comments.

### Existing Housing Element Key Findings

---

- Population has remained relatively stable. Growth pressures anticipated, particularly in Chalfant.
- Slightly lower numbers of Hispanic persons than elsewhere.
- Higher numbers of American Indians than elsewhere in the unincorporated area.
- Higher number of seniors than elsewhere.
- Rental Rate – 23%
- Overpayment – 10% of households.
- Higher number of large households (5+ persons) than elsewhere.
- Moderate number of female-headed households.
- High travel times to work; many residents work outside the County.
- Higher number of persons below poverty level than elsewhere but the number has declined.
- Higher number of persons with Social Security and Supplemental Security income than elsewhere.
- Higher number of mobile homes than elsewhere.
- Extremely limited Commercial and Mixed Use zoning that would allow for multifamily residential units.
- Individual wells and septic systems required.

### Chalfant Valley RPAC Comments – May 18, 2009

---

- No specific comments received.

- Supervisor Hazzard referred to Community Visioning process.

### **Benton/Hammil Valley RPAC Comments – May 20, 2009**

---

- Trailers in Trailer Park are barely livable. Not suitable for low-income.
- Seniors need more assistance. Couple a housing rehab program with IMACA's Weatherization program.
- Mobile Home Parks are a problem.
- Some choose to live in older housing stock
- Dangerous homes should be removed.

### **Existing Housing Element Policies & Programs pertinent to Tri-Valley**

---

- Goal- To provide an adequate supply of sound, affordable housing units in a safe and satisfying environment for all residents of the county, both present and future.
  - Policy A- Ensure that there are adequate sites and facilities to support future housing needs.
    - Objective 2- Ensure the provision of adequate services for housing development
      - Program 2.1- Encourage and assist special districts to secure grants to improve and expand sewer and water capabilities and fire protection services. The county's participation will entail aiding districts in the preparation of grant applications and in compliance with environmental requirements.
  - Policy B- Work toward attainment of the identified regional housing needs.
    - Objective 1- Meet basic housing construction needs by the construction or placement of approximately 292 units by 2014, if population growth is achieved as expected.
      - Program 1.3- In conformance with state law, permit mobile homes on all parcels zoned for conventional single-family residences.
      - Program 1.9- In communities with a limited private land base and with limited vacant land available for additional residential development, study the possibility of acquiring surrounding public lands for community expansion.
      - Program 1.10- Designate potential areas as community expansion areas/specific plan in the Land Use Element.
    - Objective 2- Encourage the provision of affordable housing to meet the needs of all economic segments and special housing groups.
      - Program 2.9- Maintain an up-to-date file of federal and state housing related programs.
  - Policy C- Maintain and improve the existing housing stock through rehabilitation, replacement and conservation.

- Objective 1- Provide for the rehabilitation and replacement of units.
  - Program 1.1- Participate in the state's Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program for rehabilitation and weatherization assistance.
  - Program 1.3- Increase the public's awareness of rehabilitation programs.
  - Program 1.4- Enforce housing code requirements and develop a housing rehabilitation program.
- Objective 2- Conserve existing housing units.
  - Program 2.1- Increase the use of home weatherization programs offered by utility companies and other groups by distributing information to homeowners and renters regarding weatherization and other programs that may assist in maintaining the affordability of housing units.
- Policy E- Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin or color.
  - Objective 1- The county shall not allow housing discrimination to interfere with the attainment of its housing goals.

## **IX. APPENDIX B**

---

### **Available Parcel Inventory**

The County's GIS system was used to identify parcels for this inventory and data related to those parcels. The County's Land Use Designations and Land Use Regulations were then utilized, along with staff knowledge of the sites, to develop a realistic unit capacity for the sites. Mono County does not have separate zoning; the Land Use Designations and Land Development Regulations in the Mono County General Plan contain the extensive site development standards and land use controls that in other communities might be included in a zoning code.

Mono County's allocated regional housing need for very low- and low-income housing is 118 units; this includes housing for extremely low-income households. The inventory for very low- and low-income housing focuses on the potential for multi-family residential development in Bridgeport, Lee Vining, and June Lake. These communities are walkable, have transportation links to the remainder of the County, are relatively close to Mammoth where many low income residents work, have higher numbers of low income service workers within the communities, have sewer and water infrastructure, and have a variety of other goods and services available within the community. Other communities in the county do not meet these criteria. All of these communities have large areas of undeveloped land that is designated for multi-family residential development, which is usually more affordable for lower income groups.



## Available Parcel Inventory – Very Low- and Low-Income Housing (includes Extremely Low-Income Housing)

APN	LUD	Calculated Area (acres)	Recorded Area	Existing Use	Infrastructure Capacity	On Site Constraints	Allowable Density	Realistic Unit Capacity
<b>June Lake</b>								
015104007000	MFR-H	0.09	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	1
015073004000	MFR-H	0.11	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	1
015103006000	MFR-H	0.11	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	1
015103017000	MFR-H	0.11	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	1
015103010000	MFR-H	0.11	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	1
015104008000	MFR-H	0.12	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	1
015104006000	MFR-H	0.14	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	2
015102022000	MFR-H	0.17	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	2
015102023000	MFR-H	0.17	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	2
015073023000	MFR-H	0.23	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	3
015102021000	MFR-H	0.23	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	3
015073025000	MFR-H	0.45	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	6
<b>June Lake Total Units:</b>								<b>24</b>

### Determination of Realistic Capacity

- All of the above parcels are designated Multi-Family Residential-High (MFR-H), a designation that is “intended to encourage multi-family units by allowing for higher population densities and to provide for commercial lodging facilities; i.e., hotels, motels.” (Mono County Land Use Designations, MFR).
- Mono County’s residential land use controls, the Land Development Regulations, are summarized in Table 48 in Chapter III of this Element. The MFR-H designation provides for a higher lot coverage than other residential designations (60 % vs. 40%), allowing for higher-density housing. Density bonuses are available in MFR designations for projects that provide affordable housing and/or enclosed, covered parking. The maximum building residential building height may be increased from 35 feet to 45 feet if side and rear setbacks are also increased, allowing larger size housing units to meet the needs of large households. The County’s land use controls and site development standards do not constrain development on these parcels.

- The June Lake Public Utility District (JLPUD) provides domestic water and sewer services to developed areas in the June Lake Loop. The PUD has sufficient capacity to serve the buildout development identified in the General Plan.
- Areas in June Lake with parcels designated MFR-H have adequate access to allow for full development of the sites.
- There are no environmental constraints to development of these sites.
- Based on the above determinations, maximum allowable development of these sites is anticipated (numbers have been rounded down to the whole number). The realistic unit capacity shown above is the maximum allowable capacity for these sites. The maximum allowable figures above do not include potential increases provided by density bonuses.

## Available Parcel Inventory – Very Low- and Low-Income Housing (continued)

APN	LUD	Calculated Area (acres)	Recorded Area	Existing Use	Infrastructure Capacity	On Site Constraints	Allowable Density	Realistic Unit Capacity
<b>Lee Vining</b>								
021050004000	C	12.74	23.38 a.	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	95
021060002000	C	10.16	10.24	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	76
021050004000	C	7.28	23.38 a.	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	54
021150022000	C	4.25	4.64 a.	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	31
021080021000	C	1.88	1.45 a.	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	14
021160011000	C	1.19	1.18 a.	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	8
021150024000	C	1.15	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	8
021142013000	C	0.84	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	6
021080022000	C	0.82	0.07 a.	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	6
021150025000	C	0.80	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	6
021150023000	C	0.76	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	5
<b>Lee Vining Total Units:</b>								<b>309</b>

### Determination of Realistic Capacity

- All of the above parcels are designated Commercial (C), a designation that is “intended to provide for a wide range of uses and services for the resident and visitor including retail, business and professional uses and services in community areas, including commercial lodging and higher density housing, when found compatible with retail and service functions ” (Mono County Land Use Designations, C).
- Mono County’s residential land use controls, the Land Development Regulations, are summarized in Table 48 in Chapter III of this Element. The C designation provides for a higher lot coverage than other residential designations (60 % vs. 40%), allowing for higher-density housing. Other standards also promote higher-density housing in the commercial designation; e.g., the C designation has a zero side yard setback unless the site abuts a residential district. The maximum building residential building height may be increased from 35 feet to 45 feet if side and rear setbacks are also increased, allowing larger size housing units to meet the needs of large households. The County’s land use controls and site development standards do not constrain development on these parcels.
- The Lee Vining Public Utility District (LVPUD) provides domestic water and sewer services to the community of Lee Vining. The PUD has sufficient capacity to serve the buildout development identified in the General Plan.
- Areas in Lee Vining with parcels designated C have adequate access to allow for full development of the sites.
- There are no environmental constraints to development of these sites.

- Commercial development in the unincorporated communities in Mono County is small scale, and is typically oriented towards meeting the lodging, dining, minor shopping needs, and recreational needs of residents and visitors. Most communities in the unincorporated area are not large enough to support extensive commercial development; most residents utilize shopping and services in surrounding larger developments (Bishop, Mammoth Lakes, Gardnerville,NV). It is anticipated that this trend will continue and that land designated for commercial uses will not be fully developed with commercial uses, particularly since there is a greater need at this point for low cost housing.
- Based on the above determinations, it is anticipated that these sites will be developed with 50 percent residential uses and 50 percent non-residential uses (numbers have been rounded down to the whole number). The realistic unit capacity shown above is 50 percent of the maximum allowable capacity.

## Available Parcel Inventory – Very Low- and Low-Income Housing (continued)

APN	LUD	Calculated Area (acres)	Recorded Area	Existing Use	Infrastructure Capacity	On Site Constraints	Allowable Density	Realistic Unit Capacity
<b>Bridgeport</b>								
008210008000	MFR-M	0.52	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	7
008220033000	MFR-M	0.48	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	7
008210005000	MFR-M	0.42	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	6
008210004000	MFR-M	0.41	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	6
008210003000	MFR-M	0.34	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	5
008201008000	MFR-M	0.18	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	15 du/ac	2
008092006000	MFR-L	0.87	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	10
008080013000	MFR-L	0.81	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	9
008133010000	MFR-L	0.69	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	8
008133031000	MFR-L	0.66	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	7
008133040000	MFR-L	0.60	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	6
008080009000	MFR-L	0.48	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	5
008091006000	MFR-L	0.46	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	5
008133041000	MFR-L	0.46	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	5
008133036000	MFR-L	0.46	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	5
008091018000	MFR-L	0.39	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	4
008133001000	MFR-L	0.38	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	4
008133022000	MFR-L	0.34	Unknown	Vacant	Yes	None	11.6 du/ac	4
<b>BP Total:</b>								<b>105</b>
<b>Total Units Available:</b>								<b>438</b>

### Determination of Realistic Capacity

- All of the above parcels are designated Multi-Family Residential-Low or Medium (MFR-L or M). The MFR-L designation is “intended to provide for low density multi-family residential development, such as duplexes and triplexes” (Mono County Land Use Designations, MFR-L). The MFR-M designation is intended “to encourage long-term multi-family housing by allowing for higher population densities and by not allowing commercial lodging facilities; i.e., hotels, motels (Mono County Land Use Designations, MFR-M).
- Mono County’s residential land use controls, the Land Development Regulations, are summarized in Table 48 in Chapter III of this Element. The MFR designations provide for a higher lot coverage than other residential designations (60 % vs. 40%), allowing for higher-density

housing. Density bonuses are available in MFR designations for projects that provide affordable housing and/or enclosed, covered parking. The maximum building residential building height may be increased from 35 feet to 45 feet if side and rear setbacks are also increased, allowing larger size housing units to meet the needs of large households. The County's land use controls and site development standards do not constrain development on these parcels.

- The Bridgeport Public Utility District (BPPUD) provides domestic water and sewer services to developed areas in Bridgeport. The PUD has sufficient capacity to serve the buildout development identified in the General Plan.
- Areas in Bridgeport with parcels designated MFR-L or M have adequate access to allow for full development of the sites.
- There are no environmental constraints to development of these sites.
- Based on the above determinations, maximum allowable development of these sites is anticipated (numbers have been rounded down to the whole number). The realistic unit capacity shown above is the maximum allowable capacity for these sites. The maximum allowable figures above do not include potential increases provided by density bonuses.

**Parcel Inventory –  
Unimproved Parcels Available for Development**

APN	LUD	Recorded Area (acres)	Calculated Area (acres)
02621001300 0	C	1.03 a.	1.03
06003000700 0	C	0.24 a.	0.22
06003000600 0	C	0.2 a.	0.21
06003000500 0	C	0.41 a.	0.39
06003000400 0	C	0.41 a.	0.38
06003000300 0	C	0.3 a.	0.28
06003000200 0	C	Unknown	0.30
06004000600 0	C	2 a.	2.06
01508604000 0	C	Unknown	0.30
01508601900 0	C	Unknown	0.12
01619100500 0	C	Unknown	1.62
01618200700 0	C	Unknown	1.27
01619303800 0	C	Unknown	0.72
01508604100 0	C	Unknown	0.49
01508603700 0	C	Unknown	0.23
01508602400 0	C	Unknown	0.10
01508602300 0	C	Unknown	0.10
01508602200 0	C	Unknown	0.10
01508603800 0	C	Unknown	0.59
01508601500 0	C	Unknown	0.11
01508600400	C	Unknown	0.12

0			
01508601600	C	Unknown	0.11
01508602000	C	Unknown	0.11
01508600200	C	Unknown	0.16
01508501100	C	Unknown	0.36
01508600100	C	Unknown	0.15
01508501000	C	Unknown	0.36
01508300500	C	Unknown	0.28
02413300800	C	1 a.	1.09
02413300300	C	2.31 a.	2.58
02413300200	C	1 a.	1.14
02413102700	C	2.78 a.	2.81
02108002100	C	1.45 a.	1.88
02115002500	C	Unknown	0.80
02115000700	C	Unknown	0.31
02115000800	C	Unknown	0.41
02115000600	C	Unknown	0.42
02115000200	C	Unknown	0.20
02115002100	C	0.5 a.	0.49
02115002200	C	4.64 a.	4.25
02114600300	C	Unknown	0.05
02114600100	C	Unknown	0.51
02115000100	C	Unknown	0.11
02114500500	C	Unknown	0.07



0			
02114500400	C	Unknown	0.09
02114700800	C	Unknown	0.05
02114500700	C	Unknown	0.16
02114500300	C	Unknown	0.12
02114700700	C	Unknown	0.03
02114700200	C	Unknown	0.21
02114500800	C	Unknown	0.16
02114700600	C	Unknown	0.08
02114700500	C	Unknown	0.17
02114700400	C	Unknown	0.16
02114700300	C	Unknown	0.16
02114700100	C	Unknown	0.11
02114501000	C	Unknown	0.16
02114400500	C	Unknown	0.22
02114300200	C	Unknown	0.35
02114400600	C	Unknown	0.11
02114400300	C	Unknown	0.17
02114400200	C	Unknown	0.17
02114400100	C	Unknown	0.17
02114400700	C	Unknown	0.12
02114400800	C	Unknown	0.11
02114400400	C	Unknown	0.35
02114401000	C	Unknown	0.17

0			
02114401100 0	C	Unknown	0.34
02114300100 0	C	Unknown	0.31
02114201200 0	C	Unknown	0.24
02114200800 0	C	Unknown	0.10
02114200500 0	C	Unknown	0.17
02114200400 0	C	Unknown	0.17
02114201300 0	C	Unknown	0.84
02116001100 0	C	1.18 a.	1.19
02103900200 0	C	Unknown	0.34
02105000400 0	C	23.38 a.	7.28
02105000400 0	C	23.38 a.	12.74
02106000200 0	C	10.24	10.16
00814202800 0	C	Unknown	0.54
00814100600 0	C	Unknown	1.29
00809301300 0	C	Unknown	0.17
00814100700 0	C	Unknown	0.09
00809302500 0	C	Unknown	0.20
00809301200 0	C	Unknown	0.80
00810200900 0	C	Unknown	0.10
00810201800 0	C	Unknown	0.04
00809200400 0	C	Unknown	0.25
00814200100 0	C	Unknown	0.22
00814200200 0	C	Unknown	0.22

0			
00814201300 0	C	Unknown	0.22
00814201100 0	C	Unknown	0.14
00814201200 0	C	Unknown	0.09
00814201800 0	C	Unknown	0.52
00814200400 0	C	Unknown	0.60
00813400800 0	C	Unknown	0.12
00814201500 0	C	Unknown	0.72
00813401400 0	C	Unknown	0.17
00813202500 0	C	Unknown	0.18
00813400600 0	C	Unknown	0.26
00813203600 0	C	Unknown	0.74
00813203500 0	C	Unknown	0.26
00813200700 0	C	Unknown	0.34
00813202600 0	C	Unknown	0.88
00813202400 0	C	Unknown	0.17
00814101300 0	C	Unknown	0.52
00813401000 0	C	Unknown	0.08
00813400200 0	C	Unknown	0.18
00813400300 0	C	Unknown	0.35
00813401100 0	C	Unknown	0.14
00814202900 0	C	Unknown	0.82
00813101000 0	C	Unknown	0.77
00813401200	C	Unknown	0.12

0			
00813401300 0	C	Unknown	0.34
00814100100 0	C	Unknown	0.21
00814100200 0	C	Unknown	1.00
00814100300 0	C	Unknown	0.10
00814100400 0	C	Unknown	0.94
00814101000 0	C	Unknown	0.17
00809301100 0	C	Unknown	0.31
00810200800 0	C	Unknown	0.21
00809301900 0	C	Unknown	0.63
00809500300 0	C	Unknown	0.14
00809500700 0	C	Unknown	0.12
00810201000 0	C	Unknown	0.16
00809301000 0	C	Unknown	0.50
00809500800 0	C	Unknown	0.25
00811200300 0	C	Unknown	0.44
00810200700 0	C	Unknown	0.26
00810200600 0	C	Unknown	0.11
00809302200 0	C	Unknown	0.87
00810201700 0	C	Unknown	0.69
00810200300 0	C	Unknown	0.37
00810200400 0	C	Unknown	0.91
00811200400 0	C	Unknown	0.52
00810201200 0	C	Unknown	1.01

0			
02413200300	C	2 a.	1.26
02413200800	C	Unknown	3.61
02413200500	C	1 a.	6.88
01121000400	C	1.83 a.	1.54
02108002200	C	0.07 a.	0.82
02115002300	C	Unknown	0.76
02115001300	C	Unknown	0.25
02115002400	C	Unknown	1.15
02114100700	C	Unknown	0.04
02114000600	C	0.5 a.	0.54
02114100600	C	Unknown	0.12
02114100500	C	Unknown	0.13
02114100300	C	Unknown	0.21
02114100200	C	Unknown	0.26
02114000500	C	0.7 a.	0.72
02114100800	C	Unknown	0.15
02114100100	C	Unknown	0.14
01511301600	C	Unknown	0.13
01511306500	C	Unknown	0.11
01511306500	C	Unknown	0.13
01511306100	C	Unknown	0.34
01511306500	C	Unknown	0.11
01511306500	C	Unknown	0.10

0			
01511306500	C	Unknown	0.11
01511306500	C	Unknown	0.11
01511303500	C	Unknown	0.09
01511303500	C	Unknown	0.03
01507502700	C	Unknown	0.59
01507500400	C	Unknown	0.11
01507500500	C	Unknown	0.11
01507502600	C	Unknown	0.36
01511306800	C	Unknown	0.00
01511306800	C	Unknown	0.77
01511306700	C	Unknown	0.20
01511306000	C	Unknown	0.11
01511305900	C	Unknown	0.14
01511305800	C	Unknown	0.15
01511306600	C	Unknown	0.21
01510404500	C	Unknown	0.72
01510404400	C	Unknown	0.38
06021001900	C	Unknown	0.41
06021005600	C	0.93 a.	0.90
06021002800	C	1.26 a.	1.31
06021002900	C	2.18 a.	2.18
06021003200	C	2.08	2.08
06018000400	C	Unknown	0.63

0			
06025001200	C	2 a.	2.01
06025001600	C	0.68 a.	0.67
06025001500	C	0.51 a.	0.40
01618300700	CL-H	Unknown	0.17
01618300900	CL-H	Unknown	0.19
01618301000	CL-H	Unknown	0.40
01618301100	CL-H	Unknown	0.42
01619201600	MFR-L	Unknown	0.20
01619302200	MFR-L	Unknown	0.28
01619201500	MFR-L	Unknown	0.18
01619302100	MFR-L	Unknown	0.27
01621702600	MFR-L	Unknown	0.19
01621703700	MFR-L	Unknown	0.17
01621703500	MFR-L	Unknown	0.21
01618201800	CL-H	1.08 a.	0.02
01618201700	CL-H	1.08 a.	0.02
01618201600	CL-H	1.08 a.	0.02
01618201500	CL-H	1.08 a.	0.02
01618201400	CL-H	1.08 a.	0.02
01618200900	CL-H	1.09 a.	0.02
01618201000	CL-H	1.09 a.	0.02
01618201100	CL-H	1.09 a.	0.02
01618201200	CL-H	1.08 a.	0.02

0			
01618201300 0	CL-H	1.09 a.	0.02
01619100300 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.46
01620101600 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.24
01614300700 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.22
01609903100 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.82
01616900600 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.60
01616900400 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.44
01510202400 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.69
01510503300 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.34
01510501100 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.11
01510500300 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.12
01510502800 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.11
01510502700 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.11
01510502600 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.11
01510501300 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.12
01510501500 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.12
01510500500 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.12
01510502300 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.11
01510503100 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.23
01510404000 0	CL-H	Unknown	0.60
01514002700 0	CL-H	0.81 a.	0.86
01514002600 0	CL-H	0.63 a.	0.63
01514004300	CL-H	0.31 a.	0.31



0			
01514004400	CL-H	0.27 a.	0.27
01514004500	CL-H	0.23 a.	0.23
01514005000	CL-H	0.41 a.	0.42
01613000500	CL-M	13.48 a.	13.24
01609800500	CL-M	Unknown	0.24
01619303600	CL-M	0.18 a.	0.18
01619202400	CL-M	Unknown	1.84
01620600700	CL-M	Unknown	0.11
01620600900	CL-M	Unknown	0.11
01619202100	CL-M	Unknown	0.09
01619303500	CL-M	0.24 a.	0.24
01610103800	CL-M	0.41 a.	0.40
01619200500	CL-M	Unknown	0.64
01620600500	CL-M	Unknown	0.13
01610204200	CL-M	Unknown	0.33
01619202100	CL-M	Unknown	0.63
01620600600	CL-M	Unknown	0.10
01620601000	CL-M	Unknown	0.10
01507302300	MFR-H	Unknown	0.23
01507302500	MFR-H	Unknown	0.45
01507300400	MFR-H	Unknown	0.11
01510301700	MFR-H	Unknown	0.11
01510202300	MFR-	Unknown	0.17

0	H		
01510202100 0	MFR- H	Unknown	0.23
01510202200 0	MFR- H	Unknown	0.17
01510301000 0	MFR- H	Unknown	0.11
01510300600 0	MFR- H	Unknown	0.11
01510400600 0	MFR- H	Unknown	0.14
01510400700 0	MFR- H	Unknown	0.09
01510400800 0	MFR- H	Unknown	0.12
01619201800 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.22
01619202600 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.36
01619302300 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.20
00813301000 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.69
00813203300 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.26
00809303200 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.24
00809302900 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.26
00809302400 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.26
00809200600 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.87
00809302000 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.24
00809300600 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.21
00809200500 0	MFR- L	Unknown	0.24
00809104700 0	MFR- L	0.21	0.21
00809104800 0	MFR- L	0.23	0.23
00821000500 0	MFR- M	Unknown	0.42
01621602900	MFR-	Unknown	0.25

0	L		
00809103000	MFR-L	Unknown	0.18
00809102500	MFR-L	Unknown	0.18
00809102000	MFR-L	Unknown	0.19
00809104400	MFR-L	Unknown	0.31
00809103600	MFR-L	Unknown	0.21
00809104000	MFR-L	Unknown	0.18
00809101800	MFR-L	Unknown	0.39
00809104200	MFR-L	Unknown	0.34
00809103800	MFR-L	Unknown	0.18
00809102900	MFR-L	Unknown	0.26
00809103700	MFR-L	Unknown	0.17
00809100600	MFR-L	Unknown	0.46
00809103100	MFR-L	Unknown	0.19
00808000900	MFR-L	Unknown	0.48
00808001300	MFR-L	Unknown	0.81
00808001200	MFR-L	Unknown	0.29
00813304000	MFR-L	Unknown	0.60
00813301200	MFR-L	Unknown	0.22
00813300100	MFR-L	Unknown	0.38
00813300200	MFR-L	Unknown	0.17
00813301800	MFR-L	Unknown	0.22
00813304100	MFR-L	Unknown	0.46
00813302200	MFR-L	Unknown	0.34

0	L		
00813303600	MFR-L	Unknown	0.46
00813303500	MFR-L	Unknown	0.17
00813303100	MFR-L	Unknown	0.66
00813303800	MFR-L	Unknown	0.33
00813303700	MFR-L	Unknown	0.25
00813301700	MFR-L	Unknown	0.22
00813201900	MFR-L	Unknown	0.10
00813201700	MFR-L	Unknown	0.14
00813201500	MFR-L	Unknown	0.12
00820100800	MFR-M	Unknown	0.18
00822003300	MFR-M	Unknown	0.48
00821000400	MFR-M	Unknown	0.41
00821000300	MFR-M	Unknown	0.34
00821000800	MFR-M	Unknown	0.52
06003001000	MU	1.78 a.	1.80
06003001100	MU	0.5 a.	0.50
06003001200	MU	0.27 a.	0.25
06003001300	MU	0.34 a.	0.34
06003002100	MU	1.47 a.	1.41
06003001400	MU	0.5 a.	0.52
06035000800	MU	18.51 a.	1.00
06035000800	MU	18.51 a.	16.69
02503002300	MU	1.49 a.	1.69

0			
01104004900 0	MU	2 a.	2.05
01104004700 0	MU	Unknown	3.84
01104003000 0	MU	Unknown	1.63
01130100100 0	MU	Unknown	0.54
01130100600 0	MU	Unknown	0.54
01129100100 0	MU	Unknown	0.54
01129100200 0	MU	Unknown	0.55
01129100400 0	MU	Unknown	0.55
01129100500 0	MU	Unknown	0.54
00821300900 0	MU	1.34	1.33
00821300300 0	MU	Unknown	0.39
00821100900 0	MU	Unknown	0.23
00821100700 0	MU	Unknown	0.24
00821300200 0	MU	Unknown	0.36
00821301100 0	MU	Unknown	0.33
00821100500 0	MU	Unknown	0.29
00821100400 0	MU	Unknown	0.29
00821301300 0	MU	Unknown	0.31
00821200200 0	MU	1.24	1.24
00821101500 0	MU	Unknown	0.71
01511203200 0	MU	Unknown	0.14
01511200800 0	MU	Unknown	0.14
01511201500	MU	Unknown	0.11

0			
01511202700 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511202600 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511201400 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511201300 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511201600 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511202900 0	MU	Unknown	0.23
01511200900 0	MU	Unknown	0.17
01511306900 0	MU	Unknown	0.34
01511304300 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511307100 0	MU	Unknown	1.26
01507401100 0	MU	Unknown	0.23
01507400100 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01507201400 0	MU	Unknown	0.24
01507401000 0	MU	Unknown	0.10
01507400800 0	MU	Unknown	0.10
01507400200 0	MU	Unknown	0.12
01507400300 0	MU	Unknown	0.13
01507201000 0	MU	Unknown	0.13
01507200900 0	MU	Unknown	0.13
01507400900 0	MU	Unknown	0.10
01507400400 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511101200 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511101300	MU	Unknown	0.11

0			
01511101500 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511103100 0	MU	Unknown	0.23
01511102600 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511102500 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511100500 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511102400 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511103000 0	MU	Unknown	0.34
01511102000 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511103200 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511103200 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511100300 0	MU	Unknown	0.14
01511100200 0	MU	Unknown	0.15
01511201800 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511203100 0	MU	Unknown	0.23
01511200400 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511200500 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01511203300 0	MU	Unknown	0.23
01511203200 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01510404800 0	MU	Unknown	0.34
01510401200 0	MU	Unknown	0.11
01510404900 0	MU	Unknown	0.23
06021000100 0	MU	1.58 a.	1.05
06021000200	MU	2.27 a.	1.98

0			
06013000200 0	MU	Unknown	1.57
06015002000 0	MU	0.23 a.	0.24
06015002000 0	MU	0.23 a.	0.12
06014000200 0	MU	Unknown	0.95
06014000600 0	MU	0.17 a.	0.77
06015000900 0	MU	0.22 a.	0.26
06015000300 0	MU	37 a.	0.37
06015001800 0	MU	Unknown	0.42
06018000800 0	MU	1.1 a.	0.96
00236101700 0	MU 1	1	0.92
00244001700 0	MU 1	1	0.97
00233203000 0	MU 1	Unknown	1.16
00233201900 0	MU 1	1	1.01
00233202800 0	MU 1	Unknown	1.77
00232000200 0	MU 1	1	1.05
00232000300 0	MU 1	2	2.10
00233202600 0	MU 1	1.86	1.77
00232001000 0	MU 1	2	2.10
00232002600 0	MU 1	1	1.06
00232002700 0	MU 1	1.95	2.04
00237002000 0	MU 1	Unknown	1.01
00237002600 0	MU 1	2.17	2.14
00234201100	MU 1	1.007	0.99



0			
00234201300 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.99
00231000700 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.51
00237001800 0	MU 1	1.62	1.60
00234101700 0	MU 1	2	2.45
00234101300 0	MU 1	1	0.98
00237001700 0	MU 1	Unknown	1.44
00231007100 0	MU 1	1.54	1.34
00236102700 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.46
00236102600 0	MU 1	Unknown	3.06
00205000700 0	MU 1	1.75	1.62
00205001300 0	MU 1	Unknown	3.16
00203002600 0	MU 1	1.378	1.38
00204001000 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.51
00203001700 0	MU 1	Unknown	6.42
00204000700 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.39
00204000100 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.68
00203002500 0	MU 1	1.033	1.03
00203002300 0	MU 1	Unknown	1.39
00204000600 0	MU 1	1.25	1.25
00121001200 0	MU 1	Unknown	1.13
00121001400 0	MU 1	Unknown	1.11
00120000100 0	MU 1	1.1	1.09
00120001300	MU 1	Unknown	3.57

0			
00236101400 0	MU 1	1.5	1.44
00236101300 0	MU 1	1.91	1.90
00236102300 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.24
00236101100 0	MU 1	4	3.89
00236103000 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.77
00236100600 0	MU 1	1	0.99
00235200100 0	MU 1	1	1.01
00235100200 0	MU 1	1.57	2.00
00236100200 0	MU 1	1.22	1.20
00235100200 0	MU 1	1.57	1.55
00205001400 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.60
00205001600 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.35
00205001400 0	MU 1	Unknown	1.15
00205001200 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.35
00203002200 0	MU 1	Unknown	10.69
00204000300 0	MU 1	1.5	1.62
00121000100 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.88
00121000200 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.61
00121000600 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.98
00121001500 0	MU 1	Unknown	2.21
00233202300 0	MU 1	1.08	0.80
00127000400 0	MU 1	Unknown	0.38
00127000300	MU 1	Unknown	0.54

0			
00127000100			
0	MU 1	Unknown	0.70
00233202700			
0	MU 1	Unknown	0.99